



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2010

No. 124

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 15, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN A. YARMUTH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Roderick Pearson, St. Mark Remnant Ministries, Central Islip, New York, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we acknowledge You as the sovereign ruler of the universe and the divine guide for all of our lives. You said ask and it shall be given, seek and you shall find, knock and the door shall be open.

To Solomon, one of the world's richest and most powerful leaders of ancient times, You offered to him, "What shall I give to you?" We offer this prayer in the same spirit of Solomon:

O God, You have shown great mercy to our Nation because our forefathers walked in Your truth, in Your righteousness, and in uprightness of heart with You. You continue to be kind towards us. You have given these, Your servants, the ability to govern and serve. Therefore, now give to them an understanding heart, wisdom to judge Your people, that they might discern between good and evil. Let Your will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven.

In the name of our Lord and Savior we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TONKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND RODERICK PEARSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York, Congressman ISRAEL, is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome Reverend Roderick Pearson as guest chaplain. He is the founder and organizer of the St. Mark Remnant Ministries in Central Islip, Long Island.

On September 26, Reverend Pearson will celebrate 14 years of pastoral leadership. He is the President of the Islip branch of the NAACP. He received the NAACP National Thalheimer Award.

Reverend Pearson has devoted himself to fighting bigotry, to building bridges, and to lifting up communities. His presence, I hope, will inspire all of us on both sides of the aisle to do the same. It is with great pride that I welcome Reverend Roderick Pearson to the House this morning.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ACCEPT AMENDMENT TO MAKE TAX CUTS PERMANENT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in 108 days, liberals will impose the largest tax increase in U.S. history. This \$3.9 trillion increase will impact every taxpayer, hurting small businesses and hardworking families by killing jobs, and a death tax devastating to family businesses such as auto dealers and farmers. I am offering an amendment to tomorrow's legislation that will prevent this job-killing tax increase by making the tax cuts permanent. I urge support for the amendment for an immediate up-or-down vote on tax cuts that are crucial to promoting jobs.

Freezing tax rates for 2 years is the first part of the two-part plan that Republicans have to create jobs in America. The second step is cutting spending by 20 percent to stop Washington's reckless spending. The time is now to act, and I urge the Rules Committee to allow an up-or-down vote on the amendment to offer tax relief to all hardworking Americans.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

SAFENET'S 35TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mrs. DAHLKEMPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6687

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional organization in Erie, Pennsylvania on their 35th anniversary of service to our community.

SafeNet is an agency of dedicated professionals and volunteers working to end domestic violence against women, men, children and the elderly by providing shelter, counseling, legal advocacy and education. SafeNet helps victims find support through a wide range of programs, working closely with hospitals, schools, law enforcement and the courts to increase awareness and understanding of domestic violence.

For 35 years, SafeNet has brought hope and help to so many people in my region. Through their public education campaign, Unmasking the Faces, SafeNet is showing us all that victims of domestic violence can overcome their experiences and become strong survivors and active members of our community.

On behalf of all the families in my region, I extend my thanks and congratulations to SafeNet on their 35th anniversary and offer my support in their mission to put an end to domestic violence.

CARTEL EXTORTION

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, violence continues to seep across the Mexican border. Narco-terrorists continue to take shots at our Border Patrol from across the Rio Grande River. Drugs and human trafficking continue as our outmanned, out-financed and outgunned law enforcement agents continue to struggle against this violence.

But how is this for a new wrinkle in the drug cartel threat? Law enforcement officials in Texas indicate that the drug cartels may have opened up a protection racket on the American side of the border. Reports show that Hispanics living on the American side are now paying protection money to the drug cartels. These Mexican cartels are threatening harm to their relatives on the Mexican side of the border. If they have relatives in Mexico, pay up or they will be hurt, or worse.

The narco-terrorist extortion racket is just another example of crime coming into America from across the border. People who say that organized crime threats crippling Mexico don't affect Americans are living in Neverland.

And that's just the way it is.

DEMOCRATIC PRO-GROWTH AGENDA

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, while Democrats work to help our country

return from the Republican recession, our top priority is to create jobs and restore responsible fiscal policies that support the middle class.

The key part of our pro-growth agenda is helping small businesses. Small businesses are indeed the economic engine, creating two-thirds of the new jobs over the past 15 years. The role of small businesses is especially important as we strive to create jobs and move this economy forward. With the right resources and the right opportunities, small businesses can respond quickly with opportunities that create jobs.

Democrats have already enacted eight tax cuts for small businesses, including tax credits, payroll tax holidays, incentives for capital investments, and other measures to help small business thrive. We passed these measures despite strong opposition from House Republicans and will continue our fight for small businesses despite their votes against the small business community.

SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I was reminded again last night why our effort to help small businesses makes sense. I was at the Alliance to Save Energy and I gave an award called the Andromeda Award to a company called O-Power. It is a small company that has developed a way to help Americans save energy, and they have been spectacularly successful. They found a way, if you share information about what your neighbors are doing, you can reduce your energy costs dramatically.

This company is growing rapidly and doing well, but these small companies need access to capital, and we are proposing plans to make sure that they can get access to capital in our efforts to increase small business lending. If we do that, these small businesses are going to thrive. We've got to get out of the gate to compete with China when it comes to clean energy and efficiency. If we pass these bills, we will. Let's keep going with small business lending.

□ 1010

SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the backbone of America's economy. More than half of American workers are employed by small businesses. In fact, 99.7 percent of businesses in the United States employ fewer than 500 people.

When I talk to small business owners in south Florida, I'm always inspired by their entrepreneurial spirit and

their tireless work ethic. It's for that reason, and it's no surprise, that 97 percent of American exports to other nations comes from products made by small businesses.

I've been a Member of Congress for exactly 5 months this morning, and the one fact in common for each of these 150 days has been that Republicans have inexplicably blocked tax cuts and better credit for America's small businesses. Every day that goes by without the Small Business Jobs and Credit Act is another day during which small business owners put off investing in new equipment, avoid hiring new workers, and see opportunities to expand pass them by.

It's time to pass this critical legislation so that small businesses can get back to doing what they do best—growing America's economy.

MAKING PRODUCTS IN AMERICA

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the high honor and responsibility of representing the Swanningson family from Kaukauna, Wisconsin. Here you see Tony and his wife, Sherry; his son, Corey; and daughter, Kayla.

Tony wrote me this note recently when his company, Appleton Coated Paper, was having problems selling paper because of illegal paper being dumped into our country by China.

"Congressman Kagen, I've been a paper maker for 18 years, and I am grateful for the opportunity to provide for my family that the industry has given me. In 2009 I lost my job, through no fault of my own and through no fault of my company, Appleton Coated. My job was stolen because somebody broke the law, and that's not right. The dumping of foreign paper into the United States from companies that are subsidized by their own governments creates a marketplace that seriously threatens my family and countless other families throughout the United States."

We're going to make it in America when we begin making things here in America as well. We need to balance our trade deals and push back against illegal paper being dumped into our domestic market by China.

DON'T CUT TAXES FOR MILLIONAIRES

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues are constantly reminding us that the administration last year said that unemployment would not get to 8 percent if we passed our Recovery Act. Well, that remains to be seen. But let's talk about a projection that they made some years ago that they don't want to talk about, and

that's that we were going to have endless surpluses. They used that prediction of endless surpluses to justify cutting taxes for the wealthiest people in the United States.

Well, those people had a great decade. On average, \$100,000 savings on taxes during that time. Did they create more jobs because they cut their taxes? No. In fact, we had actually the most stagnant period of private sector job growth in modern history.

So now, when we don't have an endless surplus, in fact, a very large deficit, and we need job creation, they say, Oh, let's cut their taxes again. It wasn't good enough that the average millionaire had his or her net worth increased by 16 percent in 2009 while every other American stagnated. No. They want to make it a little bit better for the wealthiest people in America.

We want to cut taxes for middle class America and not millionaires.

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE FIGHT FOR MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS AND DEFICIT REDUCTION; REPUBLICANS CONTINUE TO HOLD MIDDLE CLASS HOSTAGE TO TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, in this time of debate around taxes and taxation, it's hard to figure out what's really true. Republicans say this; Democrats say that. Let me tell you what's actually the fact.

The fact is that the Republicans want to give the top 2 percent of the wealthiest Americans tax breaks that would add \$700 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years. They're saying they're going to stop tax cuts for middle class people unless the top 2 percent get their tax cut that would add \$700 billion to the deficit. Now, that's not fair given that middle class people have faced foreclosure, have faced a drop in home value, have faced unemployment, have faced so many difficult economic hurdles.

Why do they insist on giving the top 2 percent a huge tax break that they don't need, only giving the top 2 percent that tax break? Middle class people need relief. Middle class people need it now.

SUBMINIMUM WAGE FOR DISABLED

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CLEAVER. There are a number of issues that fail to make it to the floor, but there's one issue that I absolutely feel strongly about and believe that the people of this Congress and the people of the Nation need to know, and that is the subminimum wage for people with disabilities.

Inclusion is a birthright. This is a civil right. And there is a rule in the

Department of Labor called 14(c). It's a certificate from the United States Department of Labor which says that people with disabilities can get paid less than subminimum wage. But it is not subminimum wage for all of them—it is hardly a wage at all. Some of these people who are on disability are making 45 cents an hour or less in sheltered workshops.

So I am suggesting that this issue is so important that it needs to be brought to the floor of the United States Congress. This is a civil right, and we need to make it something that is a priority of this Congress as soon as possible.

AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and admiration that I stand before you today to honor the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, AHEPA, Chapter 78, of Merrillville, Indiana, for being named Chapter of the Year during the association's national convention that was held in July of this year.

AHEPA Chapter 78 is to be commended for its outstanding service. AHEPA Chapter 78 was established on July 25, 1925. It currently consists of 130 members, with 13 being life members of over 50 years. In accordance with the AHEPA mission of community service, the members of Chapter 78 represent the best in all of us through their selfless giving, kindness, and generosity.

Most recently, the chapter has distinguished itself by donating significant funds to organizations throughout northwest Indiana, including Christian Haven House and Saints Monica and Luke Soup Kitchen.

For nearly two decades, the chapter has also worked tirelessly to provide safe, exceptionally well-maintained, and affordable housing for senior citizens who otherwise might today find themselves in very abject circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and the other distinguished colleagues join me in again congratulating the AHEPA Chapter 78 of Merrillville, Indiana.

JEFFERSON THOMAS OF THE LITTLE ROCK NINE

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, sophomores in high school are not often called on to lead a nation. Under the leadership of nine black students in Little Rock in 1957, including high school sophomore Jefferson Thomas, the Federal Government enforced the rights of all students to have equality of education.

Losing one of the Little Rock Nine is an event no one looked forward to. Losing one of the Little Rock Nine, sadly, is what happened on September 5, 2010, when Jefferson Allison Thomas passed away in Columbus, Ohio.

Yesterday's heroes, with death, become legends and such is the case with Jefferson Thomas. Perhaps no group of young people is as well known as Jefferson Thomas and the others we know as the Little Rock Nine. Every American, for all time, must honor and remember the heroism of these youngsters in 1957, as we have done in 1999 with the Congressional Gold Medal and also with a commemorative coin and a postage stamp.

None of us can imagine the daily torment and fear these students faced. No young person today can imagine what segregation meant for teens like Jefferson Thomas in 1957. But Jefferson Thomas knew; Jefferson Thomas acted. And Jefferson Thomas is an American hero who will be missed and honored.

□ 1020

THE HIGH HOLIDAYS

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. We are currently in the midst of the Jewish High Holidays, a holy time when we reflect on the past year and welcome a new one. To everyone who celebrated Rosh Hashanah last week, I wish you and your family a healthy and happy 5771.

During the Rosh Hashanah service at my synagogue, I was honored to offer the Jewish prayer for the United States. This prayer hopes for the day when "Peace and security, happiness and prosperity, justice and freedom may forever abide in our midst." And I can think of no more laudable and important goal than to work towards that day with all of our heart and energy.

As we pray for and work towards peace and security for the United States, we also extend those prayers to the State of Israel. The threats against the Jewish homeland are real, and we cannot allow them to go unchecked. The American people stand with our brothers and sisters in Israel, and the alliance and friendship between our two Nations remains unbreakable.

I hope that all who celebrate these meaningful High Holidays have the opportunity to do so amongst loved ones. Reflection with our friends and family is the hallmark of this time of year. From my family to yours, warmest wishes during this special season.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, if we don't act soon, middle class income families across the country will see

their taxes go up. I have spent the past 6 weeks crisscrossing the Hawaiian island chain, meeting with small business owners, workers, educators, and farmers. I've asked them how they feel about extending the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. And we agreed that the most important thing we can do now is extend the tax cuts for the middle class.

I will oppose those who hold the middle class tax cuts hostage so that people earning more than \$1 million will receive average tax cuts of \$100,000 annually. The top 2 percent of these income earners in our country can afford to pay their fair share. Extending the Bush tax cuts for this group will pile on a whopping \$700 billion to our deficit over the next 10 years.

We must pass legislation now that ensures that 98 percent of Americans and 97 percent of small businesses do not pay higher taxes next year. And let's remember that the 111th Congress and the Obama administration have already enacted eight tax cuts for small businesses. We can no longer afford to continue the tax cuts for the wealthiest among us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CONGRESSIONAL MADE IN AMERICA PROMISE ACT

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2039) to clarify the applicability of the Buy American Act to products purchased for the use of the legislative branch, to prohibit the application of any of the exceptions to the requirements of such act to products bearing a Congressional seal, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Congressional Made in America Promise Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY OF BUY AMERICAN ACT TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH; NO EXCEPTIONS FOR PRODUCTS BEARING OFFICIAL CONGRESSIONAL INSIGNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES, MATERIALS, AND SUPPLIES FOR USE OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—

“(1) APPLICABILITY TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), subsection (a) applies with respect to articles, materials, and supplies acquired for the use of any office in the legislative branch, including the House of Representatives and the Senate, in the same manner as such subsection applies with respect to articles, materials, and supplies acquired for the use of a department or independent establishment.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR PRODUCTS BEARING OFFICIAL CONGRESSIONAL INSIGNIA.—In the case of any product which bears an official insignia (including a mark resembling an official seal) of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, or the United States Congress and which is acquired for the use of an office of the legislative branch, the following shall apply:

“(A) The head of the office may not make a determination under subsection (a) that it is inconsistent with the public interest to enter into a contract in accordance with this Act.

“(B) The head of the office may not make a determination under subsection (a) that an article, material, or supply is not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of satisfactory quality.

“(C) The last sentence of subsection (a) shall not apply.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 69 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 109) is repealed.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and a Member opposed each may control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matters on the measure now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of my committee, I am pleased to bring this bill to the House. This is a very important bill designed to help create more jobs in America. Offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, H.R. 2039 extends the requirements of the Buy American Act to the legislative branch of government, including the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Several legislative branch agencies already abide by the Buy American Act, including the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Architect of the Capitol. But the

House and Senate are exempt from the Buy American Act, and it's time for that to change.

The House and the Senate buy things, many things: Pencils, pens, paper, envelopes, furniture, furnishings, office machines, and equipment of every kind. You name it. There are no reasons that Buy American requirements should not apply to the Congress as to any other Federal agency. That's what the gentlelady's legislation will accomplish.

From my perspective as chairman of the House Administration Committee, H.R. 2039 will provide us with one more tool we can use to prevent the purchase of foreign-made goods when suitable American-made goods are available.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I commend the gentlelady for introducing it, and I urge the House to pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

□ 1030

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Chairman BRADY for his leadership and the expeditious manner in which his committee dealt with this bill. I thank him for his leadership on jobs in America all the time.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2039 when it comes to a vote later today, the Made in America Promise Act, which applies the provisions of the Buy America Act that already apply to the executive branch to the legislative branch, the Congress. It is apparent to all America that we are facing a daunting job deficit.

Over 14.9 million people still are out of work. Moreover, in 2009, our Nation racked up a trade deficit of \$375 billion, and this year it's likely to be double that, with more imports coming into our Nation than exports going out. For every billion dollars of trade deficit, we lose a minimum of 10,000 more jobs.

Without this mammoth trade deficit, our economy this year would have grown 5 percent. Instead, growth was readjusted downward to 1.5 percent, a huge 3-point drop, and the worst growth rate since 1947, because trade deficits matter.

For America to address this job gap, our unconscious Nation must develop a consciousness to make it in America again, because production here equals jobs in America. That consciousness must begin here in Congress in the highest law-making branch of our Nation.

This bill applies the Buy America provisions to the legislative branch. To illustrate, just in perusing the gift shops that tourists come through in the House and Senate—and even the new congressional visitors center—look what we found, Chinese calculators, it says here on the lower United States Senate, but then look where it's made—China. There are umbrellas from China, a children's briefcase, even

with a symbolic seal from the Philippines, and an elephant piggy bank from Indonesia. We couldn't buy everything they displayed, but let me tell you, there was no consciousness that Congress should be supporting goods made in America, here at the highest lawmaking branch of our country.

How can Congress expect to strengthen American industry and create American jobs if it itself is not buying American-made goods? If there is one place in our country that should showcase items made in the U.S.A., it is right here in the Congress. How can the American people trust Congress to be responsible if it is selling goods that create jobs in other places, not here in America?

That is why H.R. 2039 was introduced in the first place, because we must employ at this time of high unemployment every opportunity to help turn our economic ship of state in a positive direction. This bill creates a clear standard. It says we must change our practices. It says we must restore manufacturing in America.

It begins to do this by raising the consciousness of our Nation that the legislative branch of our Federal Government steps forward to say it is time to make goods in America again. That is where new jobs will come from.

Under the Buy America Act, current law states that the Federal Government, but not the legislative branch, must buy American-made products. But when this bill passes, the Congressional Made in America Promise Act will apply the Buy America Act to Congress.

In addition, when dealing with any product bearing an official insignia of the House, the Senate and the Congress, H.R. 2039 will prohibit the exceptions of not purchasing American goods if they are inconsistent with the public interest, not made in sufficiently available commercial quantities, or under the price of \$2,500. This means the only exceptions will be if the goods produced here are unreasonable in cost or not used in the United States.

This Congress has taken steps to close tax loopholes that reward large corporations that outsource business and jobs overseas. We are providing tax credits to help small businesses hire new employees and sell their products and innovation overseas, but we need to do more. Congress must lead by example.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2039, help create jobs in America, help rebuild American industry by building in America once again. Vote for the Made in America Promise Act.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Committee of House Administration, the gentlewoman from California, SUSAN DAVIS.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for bringing H.R. 2039 forward today.

Mr. Speaker, the forefathers and mothers of our Nation included Con-

gress in section 1 of the Constitution for a reason. Congress is for the people by the people.

But for too long, Congress has encouraged Buy America throughout this country without setting a strong enough example here in the Halls of Congress. My colleague has just referenced a number of the pieces of goods that people purchased that were certainly not made in America.

I suspect that our forefathers would be pleased with this piece of legislation before us. As our Nation works to bolster our manufacturing sector for the 21st century and beyond, we can start with making sure that goods sold in the Capitol and Congress are made right here in the U.S.

The congressional Made in America Promise Act does just that by requiring that the rules of the Buy America Act apply to the legislative branch. By passing it, Congress is setting an example for our Nation. Goods sold in Congress should say "Made in the U.S.A."

For the people, by the people. Right now, we are seeing that getting back to the basics of making it in America is what works for our economy. In fact, in August, U.S. manufacturing expanded for the 13th straight month. Our manufacturing sector has always been a source of pride for our country, and it is still the best in the world. Now more than ever, we need to encourage the production of goods that are made in America because the more we make at home the more Americans will be able to go back to work.

I strongly support the congressional Made in America Promise Act.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2039, the Congressional Made in America Promise Act. I commend Representative MARCY KAPTUR for her leadership on this issue and working to get the bill passed.

Today, we are considering legislation that will help improve the Buy American Act, which requires the United States government to purchase goods produced and manufactured in the United States, when it is in the best interest of the United States to do so. Specifically, H.R. 2039 would amend the Buy American Act so that "Buy American" statutory requirements are applied to articles, materials and supplies used by Congressional offices. Further, the Made in America Promise Act requires that any article containing the Congressional seal be purchased from American vendors, without exception.

Mr. Speaker, this Act is an important part of the Democratic plan to assist Main Street Americans—hard-working, talented, dedicated workers. Citizens of Michigan's 15th Congressional District, unfortunately, have long been victims of outsourcing and unfair trade agreements, even before the Great Recession began. They have seen their jobs shipped overseas in large part because of corporate tax breaks encouraging outsourcing and trade policies that lower labor standards and do nothing to open up new markets for U.S. goods.

This legislation is part of an ongoing effort to save and create American jobs and continue our country on the path to economic recovery. What we have here is a choice be-

tween protecting the wealth of some versus creating opportunity for all. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for opportunity.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2039.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 2039, the Congressional Made in America Promise Act of 2009.

This bipartisan legislation ensures that the rules of the Buy American Act that apply to all states and federal agencies also apply to Congress. Under current law, states and the federal government must buy only American made products. Though exemptions exist for cases where public interest, cost or unavailability make purchasing the good prohibitive, all goods purchased by state and federal governments must be produced in the United States. Congress, however, is not subjected to this requirement.

Promoting American job growth is a priority for this Congress. This common sense legislation is example of our commitment. If passed, this legislation will apply a standard for procurement that exceeds that enforced by states and federal agencies. Any product bearing the official congressional insignias, including goods bearing a mark resembling the official seals of the U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives, and the U.S. Congress, will have to be made in America.

Mr. Speaker, the president has set an ambitious goal to significantly increase this country's exports over the next two years. This legislation contributes to that effort by ensuring that goods procured by states, federal agencies and Congress are made in the U.S.A. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2039, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BERRY AMENDMENT EXTENSION ACT

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3116) to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from procuring certain items directly related to the national security unless the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Berry Amendment Extension Act”.

SEC. 2. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT IMPOSED ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; EXCEPTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 890. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT; EXCEPTIONS.

“(a) **REQUIREMENT.**—Except as provided in subsections (c) through (e), the Secretary may not procure an item described in subsection (b) if the item is not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States.

“(b) **COVERED ITEMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An item referred to in subsection (a) is any item described in paragraph (2), if the item is directly related to the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) **ITEMS DESCRIBED.**—An item described in this paragraph is any article or item of—

“(A) clothing and the materials and components thereof, other than sensors, electronics, or other items added to, and not normally associated with, clothing (and the materials and components thereof);

“(B) tents, tarpaulins, or covers;

“(C) cotton and other natural fiber products, woven silk or woven silk blends, spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth, synthetic fabric or coated synthetic fabric (including all textile fibers and yarns that are for use in such fabrics), canvas products, or wool (whether in the form of fiber or yarn or contained in fabrics, materials, or manufactured articles); or

“(D) any item of individual equipment manufactured from or containing such fibers, yarns, fabrics, or materials.

“(c) **AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to the extent that the Secretary determines that satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any such article or item described in subsection (b)(2) grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States cannot be procured as and when needed.

“(d) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:

“(1) Procurements by vessels in foreign waters.

“(2) Emergency procurements.

“(e) **EXCEPTION FOR SMALL PURCHASES.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases for amounts not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold referred to in section 2304(g) of title 10, United States Code.

“(f) **APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.**—This section is applicable to contracts and subcontracts for the procurement of commercial items notwithstanding section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430).

“(g) **GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE.**—In this section, the term ‘United States’ includes the possessions of the United States.

“(h) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED WITHIN 7 DAYS AFTER CONTRACT AWARD IF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS APPLIED.**—In the case of any contract for the procurement of an item described in subsection (b)(2), if the Secretary applies an exception set forth in subsection (c) with respect to that contract, the Secretary shall, not later than 7 days after the award of the contract, post a notification that the exception has been applied.

“(i) **TRAINING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall ensure that each member of the acquisition workforce who participates personally and substantially in the acquisition of textiles

on a regular basis receives training on the requirements of this section and the regulations implementing this section.

“(2) **INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN NEW TRAINING PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that any training program for the acquisition workforce developed or implemented after the date of the enactment of this section includes comprehensive information on the requirements described in paragraph (1).

“(j) **CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 890 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into by the Department of Homeland Security on and after the date occurring 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1040

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Berry Amendment Extension Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act, was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL). This legislation would apply procurement requirements that have been in place since 1941 at the Department of Defense to the Department of Homeland Security.

As approved in 1941, the purpose of the Berry Amendment was to protect the United States from our enemies by requiring that the military maintain rules and regulations regarding the uniforms worn by our soldiers.

Extension of the Berry Amendment to the Department of Homeland Security is the necessary thing to do from a security standpoint. Currently, there are not any requirements on where uniforms worn by enforcing agencies such as the Transportation Security Administration and Customs and Border Protection are manufactured.

In light of ongoing threats which require the utmost protection of our safety resources and personnel, the extension of the Berry Amendment is appropriate. Further, the failure to utilize American invested workers to produce military resources is not only detrimental to American manufacturing jobs, but it is also detrimental to our Nation's security.

A beneficial side effect of the Berry Amendment is its impact on jobs. Data shows that the Berry Amendment has allowed for the sustainment of over 450,000 textile and manufacturing jobs here in the United States. Further, using data from the U.S. Department of Commerce, it is estimated that for every \$1 billion in manufacturing output, 12,500 jobs are created in the United States.

During these trying economic times, H.R. 3116 provides us with a unique opportunity to create new jobs here in America, thereby giving U.S. workers any opportunity to “Make it in America.” This is where we all should stand.

As a strong supporter of U.S. manufacturing, I believe that it is our duty as a Congress to protect American jobs through our support of those small businesses that manufacture high quality textile products here in the United States.

Lastly, let us not forget most importantly that H.R. 3116 takes away a vulnerability in the procurement system. The law enforcement officials who work to protect our southern border—and northern border, for that matter as well—have witnessed drug couriers using phony uniforms to avoid detection in the smuggling of illegal drugs into the United States.

Considering the loose regulations on the location and types of facilities that manufacture uniforms worn by those who protect our Nation, we must take necessary steps to prevent smugglers from using our own uniforms to assist in their illegal activities and, worse, highlight vulnerabilities in the U.S. Homeland Security environment.

I fully support this legislation, H.R. 3116, under consideration and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

This bill amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from procuring certain items—including textiles such as clothing, tents, canvas and cotton—unless they are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States. By requiring the Secretary to procure certain items from within the U.S., this bill takes an important step in promoting U.S. job growth and supporting large and small businesses alike.

The Department of Homeland Security employs over 150,000 uniformed men and women who are dedicated to the Department's vital mission of protecting the homeland against a range of threats. The U.S. Customs and Border Protection, for example, employs over 21,000 officers and 20,000 Border

Patrol agents, and these numbers continue to grow. The Transportation Security Administration has 48,000 officers. The U.S. Coast Guard has over 50,000 uniformed personnel. These growing numbers represent an opportunity to produce uniforms and other materials in the U.S. to support their mission, rather than overseas. This, in turn, will help create American jobs in this troubled economy.

The bill provides for exceptions in certain situations, including procurements by vessels in foreign waters, emergency procurements, low-cost procurements, and if items of sufficient quantity or quality are not available when needed.

The bill also includes language requiring its provisions to be applied in a manner consistent with U.S. obligations under international agreements.

H.R. 3116 is a commonsense piece of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

Mr. KISSELL. I would like to thank my colleague from California for yielding the time and also for her strong support for made in America and U.S. manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act. For over 60 years, the Berry Amendment has served as the law by which the Department of Defense has had to purchase uniforms for our military. It has served its purpose well in protecting the men and women of our services with having the best uniforms and also protecting Americans that make these uniforms in providing for the jobs thereof.

In January of 2009, shortly after I was sworn in as a freshman Congressman, folks came to me and asked me if I would help extend the Berry Act in homeland security to just the TSA part. Now, I could not understand why this had not been done before, but I was assured it had been tried and had been unsuccessful because there was apparently a lot of special interest that was in opposition to this.

Having worked 27 years in textiles myself, I gladly took on this initiative, and with a lot of help, we were able to overcome the special interest, and we were able to get the extension of the Berry Act to the amendment for the Recovery Act applying just to TSA. We immediately went to work to introduce a bill of legislation that would complete this process by making all of Homeland Security very compliant.

I'm glad to say with a lot of support, and a lot of bipartisan support, today we are successful in bringing that bill to the floor. It makes sense. It's only logical for all of the reasons that have been given that we extend to Homeland Security and all the people that work there, whether it be Border Patrol,

TSA, ICE, Coast Guard, and Secret Service, in whatever function that they have, the uniforms that are the best, and the best is always made in the United States.

Textiles have suffered a lot through the years. It's estimated that, since December of 2000, the United States has suffered a \$575 billion deficit in textiles and apparel, a loss of over 587,000 jobs. In the most recent economic downturn, textiles has lost 60,000 jobs with the closing of over 44 textiles plants.

But textiles has not gone away. Textiles is energetic. It's creative. It represents the American entrepreneurial spirit, and it is surviving. This bill is a logical step to not only protect our Nation's security by having American uniforms on those that protect us in Homeland Security, but also protects American security by protecting American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, just two examples of the good that came out of just the TSA amendment. We received a letter shortly after we passed this act that was from Arkansas. Twenty people wrote to thank us for passing that act because it saved their jobs. Now, that's just 20 people, but that's 20 families in an economic downturn that didn't have to worry about jobs. Richmond Yarns, located in a small town near my hometown, credits the TSA amendment for not only their survival but creating 80 additional jobs. We have seen this and heard this time and time again from just the amendment that we passed with TSA. We will see this expand even further when we pass this legislation.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who grew up in a family that depended on a textile plant check to put food on the table, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to a real champion of the textile industry, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

□ 1050

Mr. COBLE. I thank my colleague from Alabama. You indicate your involvement and exposure to textile employment, as did my friend from North Carolina. My late mom was a textile worker, so I, too, appreciate the significance of textile employment.

The Berry amendment requires the U.S. Defense Department to buy American for certain products that are judged to be essential to our military readiness. Buy American means that 100 percent of the product is produced and manufactured in the United States.

The Berry amendment helps ensure that we have a reliable domestic source for certain vital goods during time of war, and that our troops are equipped with the highest quality equipment. The Berry amendment has worked well. I am not aware of any situation,

Mr. Speaker, where it has limited the ability of our military to procure items, and it has ensured that our troops receive the highest quality essential equipment. Finally, it helps contain costs in the long term.

H.R. 3116 will expand this requirement to the Department of Homeland Security. DHS, as we all know, has grown. And while the Berry amendment has been successful for our military, I see no reason why it would not be equally successful for DHS. The requirement is not unlimited because government procurement policies are also covered by the World Trade Organization rules. Berry-type requirements are only permissible for agencies that are critical to national security. As a result, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that H.R. 3116 would only apply to the Transportation Security Administration because of its national security role in securing our various and sundry airports.

I am pleased that President Obama supported the Berry amendment while he was serving in the Senate and hope that his views on this matter have not changed, and I think they probably have not.

The Berry amendment, furthermore, has been endorsed by AMTAC, the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, and NCTO, the National Council for Textile Organizations. Economically, this requirement makes a lot of sense. Currently the Berry amendment is responsible for approximately 70,000 jobs, half of which are in the domestic textile industry. Conservative estimates from textile industry associations indicate another 21,000 jobs could be created by extending the Berry amendment to the Department of Homeland Security.

I urge my colleagues to support this Berry amendment, a very worthwhile proposal.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3116, the Berry amendment, extends the wisdom of our forefathers to properly secure our military uniforms to the 21st century of our extended protectors in homeland security such as the airport TSA workers and Customs and Border Protection workers. H.R. 3116 is putting American workers and the American economy first by making it in America.

I thank Mr. KISSELL and Chairman THOMPSON for their leadership, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to speak in support of H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

As introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. KISSELL, H.R. 3116 would require the Department of Homeland Security to purchase uniforms and textiles that are Made-

in-America under the Berry Amendment, just as the Department of Defense has done since 1941.

I am pleased to support this legislation which will serve as a means to support hard-working farmers and small textile manufacturers that are, unfortunately, becoming more and more uncommon in the United States.

Moreover, as Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am always looking for ways to provide greater security for the United States. Representative KISSELL's legislation does just that.

At present, the uniforms worn by Department of Homeland Security personnel such as Customs and Border Protection Officers and Transportation Security Administration Officers are made in locations outside our Nation's borders.

On August 31, 2010, the Washington Post reported that drug couriers often move illegal drugs across the United States-Mexico border through the use of disguises.

Often times these "cloners" as they are referred to by law enforcement officials, wear false law enforcement uniforms made outside of the United States.

Under current policy, there is nothing to prevent these "cloners" from obtaining uniforms from foreign factories and using them to transport illegal drugs and other contraband across our borders.

By restricting the manufacturing of Department of Homeland Security uniforms to the United States, we will be taking a smart step forward to prevent foreign access to the badges, patches, and uniforms that identify our homeland security personnel.

This legislation has the support of the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, the National Council of Textile Organizations and the American Apparel and Footwear Association.

Considering our Nation's current economic situation and the need to take every effort to secure our borders, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, which will take sensible steps to create opportunities for domestic manufacturing, promote job creation in the United States, and make our country safer.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3116, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST RESPONDER ANTI-TERRORISM TRAINING RESOURCES ACT

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3978) to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept and use gifts for otherwise authorized

activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to preparedness for and response to terrorism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act".

SEC. 2. ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS FOR FIRST RESPONDER TERRORISM PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in title V (6 U.S.C. 311 et seq.), by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 525. ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and may accept gifts of services, including from guest lecturers, for otherwise authorized activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to efforts to prevent, prepare for, protect against, or respond to a natural disaster, act of terrorism, or other man-made disaster, including the use of a weapon of mass destruction.

"(b) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary may not accept a gift under this section if the Secretary determines that the use of the property or services would compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of—

"(1) a program of the Department; or

"(2) an individual involved in a program of the Department.

"(c) REPORT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an annual report disclosing—

"(A) any gifts that were accepted under this section during the year covered by the report;

"(B) how the gifts contribute to the mission of the Center for Domestic Preparedness; and

"(C) the amount of Federal savings that were generated from the acceptance of the gifts.

"(2) PUBLICATION.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be made publically available.";

(2) in section 873(b) (6 U.S.C. 453(b)), by striking "and by section 93" and all that follows through "or donations" and inserting "by section 93 of title 14, United States Code, or by section 525 or 884 of this Act, gifts or donations"; and

(3) in section 884 (6 U.S.C. 464), by adding at the end the following:

"(c) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF GIFTS.—The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center may accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and accept services, for authorized purposes.".

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended in the table of contents by inserting after the item relating to section 524 the following:

"Sec. 525. Acceptance of gifts.".

(2) REPEAL.—The matter under the heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" under the heading "FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER" under title IV of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004 (6 U.S.C. 464a) is amended by striking "Provided, That in fiscal year 2004 and thereafter, the Center is authorized to accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and to accept services, for authorized purposes: Provided further," and inserting "Provided,".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept and use gifts for otherwise authorized activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to preparedness for a response to terrorism, and for other purposes.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As chairwoman of the Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response Subcommittee, I am pleased to join the original sponsor of this legislation, the ranking member of that very subcommittee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, in strong support of the First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act.

Mr. ROGERS' district is home to the Center for Domestic Preparedness, also known as the Center throughout my comments, and one of the Nation's premier training sites. At the Center, thousands of first responders from all 50 States receive hands-on training for real world incidents involving chemical, biological, explosive, radiological and other hazardous materials.

As we saw last week on nationwide TV when a ruptured pipeline sent a ball of fire into the neighborhoods of San Bruno, California, completely blowing to pieces four homes, killing four people, in addition to four people who are still missing, this training is vital, and we must continue to find creative ways to strengthen it.

I am pleased that the legislation before us today will enhance the training of our first responders. Given the Center's leading role in all-hazards training, the facility often receives offers of resources and donations, including training displays, emergency response equipment, and guest lectures.

The ability to accept, process, and utilize these donations and gifts would strengthen the Center's ability to offer high-quality emergency response training, as well as in difficult times reduce costs for the Center itself.

Pursuant to current rules and law, the Center for Domestic Preparedness currently lacks the legal authority to accept these types of resources, gifts, and services. The enactment of H.R.

3978 would permit the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept and use gifted items for authorized activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to preventing, preparing for, protecting against, or responding to all-hazards.

The legislation further directs the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, to report annually to Congress on any gifts that were accepted and how they might contribute to the Center's mission. The report must also describe the amount of federally funded savings that were generated from the acceptance of these gifts, which is very important as we look for ways to trim costs. The bill also amends the Homeland Security Act to authorize the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to accept and use gifts, donations, and services. For these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, September 14, 2010.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I write to you regarding the Senate amendment to H.R. 3978, the "First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act".

We note that the Senate amendment to H.R. 3978 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Given that the House is scheduled to call up the measure without formal referral of the bills to committees of jurisdiction, I request an acknowledgement that nothing waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 3978.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure in the House.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2010.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBERSTAR: Thank you for your letter regarding the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978, the "First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act."

I acknowledge that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a jurisdictional interest in provisions contained within the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978. I further acknowledge that the lack of a formal referral of the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978 does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I will ensure that this exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of final passage of H.R. 3978, the First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act.

Thanks to strong bipartisan support in both the House and Senate, we are here today with legislation that provides the CDP with authority to accept donations of items such as railcars, subway cars, emergency response equipment, and other property and services that would help bolster training.

I introduced this bill last November to ensure that first responders who train at East Alabama's Center For Domestic Preparedness have access to all available resources that will strengthen their training activities.

This bill was passed by the House on December 15, 2009 by a vote of 413-1. On August 5, the bill passed the Senate with an amendment by unanimous consent.

I would like to thank Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KING as well as Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS for their support of the bill in moving it forward in both chambers.

The CDP, located in my district in Anniston, Alabama, delivers one-of-a-kind, hands-on training to America's emergency responders. Training at the CDP is fully funded by the Department of Homeland Security. State and local responders from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories have trained at this center.

Like other training centers, the CDP often receives offers of donations to assist their training courses. However, the CDP does not have the legal authority to accept those donations, and has been forced to turn them down in the past. My bill fixes this problem.

As amended by the Senate, the bill ensures that CDP may accept donations in support of its entire all-hazards missions. The bill also includes language to ensure that no gifts are accepted if they are determined to compromise the integrity or the appearance of integrity of a program of the department or an individual associated with the department, and the annual report to Congress on donations accepted must be made available to the public.

The bill would also authorize the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to accept gifts under the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as it has been doing under the 2004 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

□ 1100

Simply put, this legislation is a win-win for our first responders, the American taxpayer and the Center for Domestic Preparedness; and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the CDP—the Center for Domestic Preparedness—and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center are law enforcement training organizations for numerous Federal, State and local agencies, and they provide vital preparation to our law enforcement community. In fact, it could definitely benefit from the use of these additional resources. By allowing DHS-supported training centers to accept these gifts, this legislation will help tap into the generosity of the American people and the companies to enhance the training for thousands of first responders. In turn, I expect it will save a significant amount of taxpayer dollars.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important homeland security legislation, and I commend Mr. ROGERS for his efforts.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3978, a bill that would permit the Center for Domestic Preparedness and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to accept gifts and donations in order to better train our nation's first responders. As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I was pleased that H.R. 3978 received broad bipartisan support in the House and passed the Senate unanimously. I urge my colleagues to support the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3978.

Madam Speaker, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Center for Domestic Preparedness (Center) is the nation's leading all-hazards first-responder training center. The Center trains thousands of first responders and is especially well-known for its weapons of mass destruction training facility. It is of significant interest to the Committee and many of us have visited the campus to see the important training that takes place.

The Center often receives offers of donated goods and services, such as training displays, response equipment, and trailers. These donations would allow the Center to offer stronger training opportunities at a lower cost to the Department of Homeland Security and the American taxpayer. The Center, however, does not have the legal authority to accept gifts that would enhance its ability to deliver superior training.

The Senate Amendment to H.R. 3978 would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to permit the Center to receive donated gifts and services that are related to preventing, preparing for, protecting against, or responding to all-hazards, including natural disasters, acts of terrorism and other man-made disasters. The legislation further calls on the Secretary of Homeland Security to annually report to Congress on the gifts accepted, how the gifts contribute to the mission of the Center and the amount of Federal savings that were generated from the acceptance of the gifts.

The bill also amends the Homeland Security Act to authorize the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to accept and use gifts, donations, and services.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3978 will pay immediate dividends for our first responder community by enhancing their training with more resources. The Committee will continue to support these important training centers and the brave work of our first responders. I support the passage of the Senate

Amendment to H.R. 3978 and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3978.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING ANNIVERSARY OF LAW CREATING REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS (REITS)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1595) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the passage of legislation that created real estate investment trusts (REITs) and gave millions of Americans new investment opportunities that helped them build a solid foundation for retirement security and has contributed to the overall strength of our economy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1595

Whereas, on September 14, 1960, President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed into law tax legislation enabling real estate investment trusts (hereinafter referred to as "REITs") to be established throughout the United States under regulations set by the Federal Government;

Whereas the passage of this legislation enabled REITs to provide all investors with the same opportunity to invest in large-scale commercial real estate that previously was open only to large financial institutions and wealthy individuals through direct investment in such real estate;

Whereas REITs have placed within the reach of the average American investor large-scale commercial real estate investment through publicly traded, regulated securities, which provide investors with transparency and liquidity;

Whereas REITs, by expanding the opportunity to invest in commercial real estate, a separate and distinct asset class important to the creation of balanced investment portfolios, have enabled millions of Americans to gain the benefits of dividend-based income, portfolio diversification and improved overall investment performance;

Whereas REITs have helped millions of Americans successfully invest for their retirement security over the past half-century; and

Whereas September 14, 2010, will mark the 50th anniversary of the legislation that created this REIT investment opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives recognizes the 50th anniversary of the passage of the legislation that created real estate investment trusts (REITs) and the enhanced opportunities for investment and retirement security that have been afforded to Americans from all walks of life as a result of this landmark legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1960, President Eisenhower signed legislation into law, creating real estate investment trusts.

House Resolution 1595 celebrates the 50th anniversary of REITs, as they are called, and the enhanced opportunities they provide for investments in real estate by Americans from all walks of life. REITs allow individual investors to purchase interests in portfolios of real estate assets. In many instances, REITs also operate the properties that they own.

To qualify as a REIT, these companies must distribute 90 percent of their income back to their shareholders in the form of dividends. As noted in the resolution, REITs have given average American investors access to large-scale commercial real estate investment opportunities through publicly traded, regulated securities, which provide investors with transparency and liquidity.

Four REITs are headquartered in my home State of Tennessee, and nearly 800 Tennessee properties are owned by REITs. Across the country, REITs own approximately \$500 billion commercial real estate properties, approximately 10 to 15 percent of institutionally owned commercial real estate.

In 2009, REITs paid over \$13.5 billion in dividends. More than 30 countries around the world have passed legislation enabling REITs. Again, they have helped millions of average American investors to participate in the real estate markets of this country as well as others.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the passage of House Resolution 1595, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. TIBERI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIBERI. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee as well for being here on the floor to recognize that 50 years ago, in fact, this week, President Eisenhower signed into law legislation that created real estate investment trusts, or REITs, as the gentleman said, which are investment vehicles that have allowed millions and millions of Americans expanded opportuni-

ties to invest in commercial real estate.

Mr. Speaker, while we take for granted that middle class investors and middle class Americans across our country have the opportunity to invest in commercial real estate, it is important to note that prior to 1960 it was only large financial institutions and wealthy Americans who had the means to do so. Over the last 50 years, REITs have greatly expanded that opportunity by allowing investors of all income levels to buy publicly traded, regulated shares of these commercial real estate investment vehicles.

REITs haven't just allowed middle class Americans to diversify their investment portfolios. They have also helped build our local communities—a true win-win situation. Indeed, over the last five decades, these investment vehicles have helped finance important commercial real estate projects in every one of our congressional districts across our country—from hotels to shopping malls, to hospitals, to office parks. In fact, in my congressional district, I am honored to have a number of important entities that are REITs, that truly people in our district don't even realize are real estate investment trusts, which, collectively, employ thousands of central Ohioans. Fifty years after enactment, REITs remain an important part of our Tax Code.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill with Congressman LEVIN and Congressman CAMP, the lead sponsors; and I am pleased to be part of this resolution of recognizing their 50-year anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Let me thank the manager for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the passage of legislation that created real estate investment trusts.

I happen to come from the City of Chicago. I represent downtown Chicago, and of course it is an investment opportunity, not only in Chicago but all over America, for individuals to make use of this opportunity. So, for the last 50 years, they have had that opportunity, and I look forward to seeing it continue to grow and to develop. I appreciate the opportunity to say that I think real estate investment trusts are very important to the economy of our country, and I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee's agreeing for me to speak on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H. Res. 1595 to recognize the 50th anniversary of real estate investment trusts.

For the last 50 years, we have seen how these publicly traded REITs have provided American investors with an affordable way to invest in real estate. I do a lot of work with livable communities. I want to congratulate the REIT industry for their efforts to pursue practices that will reduce the carbon footprints of their properties.

□ 1110

We are dealing with serious problems of energy efficiency and carbon pollution. Buildings account for almost 40 percent of our country's total energy consumption and 72 percent of our electricity consumption. This is one area where the industry has had a footprint that extends from coast to coast.

I commend the REIT industry for joining with Energy Star to find ways to improve the energy efficiency of the industry. I am pleased to see honorees of this program include the Simon Property Group, AMB Property Corporation, and ProLogis—which owns property in my congressional district.

I have enjoyed working with the REIT industry to introduce H.R. 4599, the Renewable Energy Expansion Act, which extends and improves the Recovery Act's grant program for renewable energy production and involves the real estate investment trusts in this arena. I have worked with my colleague, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, to resolve a technical barrier which will dramatically enhance the ability of REITs to access these grants. It is just one example of where, working with the industry, we have been able to deal with long-term benefits to our communities, stabilizing investments, strengthening neighborhoods, working on ways to make sure we are productive, and that families are safer, healthier and more economically secure. I congratulate them on 50 years of progress and look forward in the future to having them as valuable allies in this effort.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1595, Recognizing the 50th Anniversary of Real Estate Investment Trusts.

Fifty years ago, Congress passed tax legislation to enable real estate investment trusts to be created. Before REITs, only financial institutions and the wealthy could afford to invest in commercial real estate. REITs allow all investors to have these same opportunities to invest directly in real estate. REITs opened the market to individual investors of all income levels, providing the chance to invest in real estate the way they invest in other industries, to diversify their portfolios, and generate income for their families for a secure future.

REITs in the U.S. have grown into a market worth over \$300 billion. The tax reforms passed by Congress in 1986 permit REITs to operate and manage property themselves and REIT subsidiaries now manage everything from residential housing to health care facilities. Over 100 REITs are now publicly traded. These developments allow even more growth opportunities for individuals who include REITs in their retirement financial planning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the 50th anniversary of Real Estate Investment Trusts.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of the legislation that enabled the formation of Real Estate Investment Trusts, or REITs.

Today's REITs provide investors with an open and liquid option to invest in high-quality commercial real estate.

Throughout the country, REITs owned companies provide management and leasing services to tenants ranging from health care to retail, and multifamily housing to lodging and self-storage sectors. Thanks to the liquidity and capital raising advantages enjoyed by publicly held REITs, many of these tenants have found an effective and efficient way to improve or expand their facilities while remaining focused on their core business.

REITs are pursuing forward looking policies that seek to reduce their carbon footprints with energy consumption reduction and by minimizing the energy requirements of their new buildings. In New Jersey, REITs own over twenty buildings that qualify for the Energy Star label.

On the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the first REIT law, I look forward to supporting Chairman LEVIN's resolution commemorating this occasion as it comes to the floor, and I encourage the industry to continue its commitment to sustainability and providing its investors with a vehicle to advance both their investments and the surrounding communities.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1595, and I am pleased to be the lead Republican cosponsor of the resolution along with the distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

This important and timely resolution celebrates the 50th anniversary of legislation authorizing real estate investment trusts, or REITs. President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed this legislation into law one-half century ago, September 14, 1960.

Over that half century, REITs have helped finance the very projects that have built the main streets and downtowns of each and every one of our communities, from shopping malls and health care facilities, to business parks, high-rises and waterfronts. Today, REITs provide Americans from all income levels the opportunity to pool their resources and invest in large scale commercial real estate ventures.

That has not always been the case. Prior to the 1960 legislation, only the very wealthiest individuals and corporations had the accumulated capital required to invest in commercial real estate. Thanks to REITs and the unique financial incentives they offer to their shareholders, more middle class Americans can save and invest, whether it is for a college education, a new home, or a secure retirement.

I am proud to support this commemorative resolution, and I urge my House colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1595, a resolution introduced by my colleagues Representatives LEVIN and CAMP, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the establishment of real estate investment trusts, or REITs.

Prior to 1960, access to the returns for investments in high-quality commercial real estate assets was limited to institutions and indi-

viduals with significant financial resources. To remedy this, Congress adopted legislation establishing REITs to make it easier for small investors to invest in commercial properties, similar to mutual funds, by pooling their resources. President Eisenhower signed the legislation into law on September 14, 1960, fifty years ago today.

As my colleagues know, REITs are companies dedicated to owning and operating income-producing real estate, such as apartments, shopping centers, regional malls, office buildings, industrial warehouses, hotels and lodging, health care facilities, and self-storage buildings. Federal tax law requires that REITs meet specific tests regarding the composition of their gross income and assets, but the key feature of a REIT is the requirement that at least 95 percent of a REIT's taxable income be returned to its shareholders every year. For example, in 2008, REITs returned approximately \$17.8 billion to shareholders in the form of dividends. These income returns have been one of the primary reasons why the industry has performed so well over the years. In addition, REITs have been recognized for the diversification benefits they bring to individual portfolios, the efficiency of their liquidity attributes, and the professional management practices they bring to the table.

Congress created the path for REITs to exist 50 years ago today, and Congress has continued to preserve and perfect the REIT method of real estate investing through the adoption of targeted legislation that has mirrored the changing investment marketplace.

I want to congratulate the REIT industry on this important milestone and I hope that the REIT method of investing continues to be strong, efficient and effective in today's economy.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1595.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPTAIN RHETT W. SCHILLER POST OFFICE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5873) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218 North Milwaukee Street in Waterford, Wisconsin, as the "Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5873

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN RHETT W. SCHILLER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218

North Milwaukee Street in Waterford, Wisconsin, shall be known and designated as the "Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, it is my honor to rise in support of H.R. 5873. This measure designates the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 218 North Milwaukee Street in Waterford, Wisconsin, as the Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office.

H.R. 5873 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative PAUL RYAN, on July 27, 2010. The measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on July 28, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of the entire Wisconsin delegation to the House, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for introducing this measure. I would also like to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their support for the bill.

Captain Rhett W. Schiller was born on November 7, 1980 in Racine, Wisconsin. His family later moved to Waterford, Wisconsin. In 2003, Schiller graduated from West Point and was commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant of Infantry. He was assigned to the 82nd Airborne at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, first as a platoon leader in Company B, and later Executive Officer for Company A of the 3rd Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment.

Schiller's brigade was deployed to New Orleans in September, 2005 to assist with relief efforts after Hurricane Katrina. His unit was deployed and conducting relief operations only 7 hours after the assignment was announced. The standard deployment time is 18 hours after notification.

In 2006, Captain Schiller was assigned to 5th Squadron, 73rd Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division. On his 100th day in country, while leading a squad of six paratroopers and six Iraqi Army soldiers on a canal clearing operation near Balad Ruz, Diyala Province, Captain Schiller's unit came under small

arms fire. Captain Schiller was killed in action on November 16, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Schiller is remembered as a hard-charging leader who did everything he could to take care of his soldiers, raising the spirits and motivation of everyone around him. His life and achievements over the course of his service speak volumes about all of our brave servicemen and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation. Let us now pay tribute to the life of Captain Rhett Schiller through the passage of this legislation. I urge all of our colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5873.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my honor today to rise in support of H.R. 5873 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218 North Milwaukee Street in Waterford, Wisconsin, as the Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this post office in Waterford for Captain Schiller to honor a true American hero and his service to our country.

Captain Rhett W. Schiller was born on November 7, 1980 in Racine, Wisconsin. Upon graduation from high school in 1999, Captain Schiller was appointed to the United States Military Academy at West Point by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN). Captain Schiller graduated from West Point in 2003 with a major in Chinese and was then commissioned as an infantry officer. He was assigned to the 82nd Airborne Division in Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

In September of 2005, after Hurricane Katrina devastated the gulf coast, Captain Schiller and his unit were deployed to New Orleans to come to the aid of millions along the gulf coast, including the citizens of the district that I represent. It took only 7 hours for Captain Schiller's unit to gear up and deploy to New Orleans. According to Major Tom Earnhardt, Army spokesperson for Captain Schiller's division, the typical deployment time is 18 hours. He described Captain Schiller's work to get his unit deployed to New Orleans in only 7 hours as extraordinary and a truly remarkable achievement. On behalf of the constituents whom I represent and the millions of people who were impacted by Hurricane Katrina, I want to thank Captain Schiller and the other brave men and women who came to our aid in a time of need.

In 2006, Captain Schiller was made a company executive officer and was deployed to serve in Iraq as part of a reconnaissance, surveillance and target acquisition team. Sadly, on November 16, 2006, his 100th day serving in Iraq, Captain Schiller was killed in action when his unit came under attack and encountered small arms fire.

Captain Schiller was awarded the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Meritorious

Service Medal and Army Commendation Medal, among others, for his service to our country. Described by his troop commander as the "epitome of the Army officer and an Airborne Ranger," Captain Schiller's love for the Army and his country was always apparent.

□ 1120

He was known as an officer who led by example, and according to his squadron commander, "raised the spirits and the motivation of all those that knew him."

Mr. Speaker, it is proper that we pass this legislation to honor the memory of a true American hero, U.S. Army Captain Rhett W. Schiller, who made the ultimate sacrifice promoting freedom and protecting our country. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank my colleagues on a bipartisan basis for doing this.

As the chief sponsor of this, I rise in support of H.R. 5873, which would designate the United States Postal facility at 218 North Milwaukee Street in Waterford, Wisconsin, as the "Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office."

In 1999 I had the pleasure of appointing Rhett, Captain Schiller, to the United States Military Academy at West Point, an institution from which he subsequently graduated with a major in Chinese. Following his graduation, Captain Schiller was assigned to the 82nd Airborne at Fort Bragg, first as a platoon leader in Company B and later as an executive officer for Company A of the 3rd Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment.

In 2006 he was assigned to the 5th Squadron, 73rd Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division. Very cool. It was in this capacity that he was deployed to Iraq as part of a Reconnaissance, Surveillance, and Target Acquisition Team.

On his 100th day in the country, while leading a squad of six paratroopers and six Iraqi Army soldiers, Captain Schiller's unit came under small arms fire during a canal cleaning operation. Captain Schiller was killed in action on November 16, 2006.

He has earned the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Iraqi Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Army Ranger Tab, the Expert Infantryman Badge, the Combat Infantryman Badge, the Master Parachutist Badge, and he graduated as the honor graduate from his Reconnaissance and Surveillance Leadership course. Captain Schiller also qualified for the Army Commendation Medal.

I knew Rhett Schiller. He was a young man coming out of Waterford,

Wisconsin, in Racine County, idealistic, energetic, extraordinarily gifted, and patriotic. He became a leader in our military in the Army. He served under the command of a very personal close friend of mine, Colonel Andy Poppas from Janesville, Wisconsin, who I grew up with, who also went to West Point, and was his commanding officer.

When we heard that he was killed in action, Andy and I had emailed each other at that time about this. Colonel Poppas emailed Rhett's dad, who had put long years over at S.C. Johnson Wax.

From his own commanding officer, who, like I said, is a good friend of mine, this is a story of a man who was brave. This is a story of a man who cared about his country and who cared about the men and women he served with and who put himself in harm's fire so that he could protect those around him, those he was serving with.

And this is the stuff that makes our country great. It is this kind of dedication, this kind of sacrifice that the best and brightest within our communities come to the military to serve our country and all that it stands for. This is why we do these bills, why we do this dedication, and why it is so wholly proper and fitting to dedicate this post office in Waterford, Wisconsin, the "Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office."

I'm so proud to do this. I am pleased that my entire Wisconsin delegation are cosponsors of this legislation so that we can have this proper and fitting memorial so that when young people go through the post office, they will know that one among their ranks in their community stood up, offered bravery, service to country. And that is the kind of example that makes this country the freest, greatest, most exceptional, and prosperous country in the world. And I'm just so proud to have known Rhett Schiller and so proud to actually sponsor this legislation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I continue to reserve.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I urge that all Members support this very meaningful legislation to name the post office after a true American hero.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I want to thank our colleague from Wisconsin for bringing to the attention of this body the service of Captain Rhett Schiller to this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5873.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULES USAGE ACT OF 2010

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2868) to provide increased access to the General Services Administration's Schedules Program by the American Red Cross and State and local governments, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Supply Schedules Usage Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS AND OTHER QUALIFIED ORGANIZATIONS TO USE FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULES FOR CERTAIN GOODS AND SERVICES.

Section 502 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) USE OF SUPPLY SCHEDULES BY THE RED CROSS AND OTHER QUALIFIED ORGANIZATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may provide for the use by the American National Red Cross and other qualified organizations of Federal supply schedules. Purchases under this authority by the American National Red Cross shall be used in furtherance of the purposes of the American National Red Cross set forth in section 300102 of title 36, United States Code. Purchases under this authority by other qualified organizations shall be used in furtherance of purposes determined to be appropriate to facilitate emergency preparedness and disaster relief and set forth in guidance by the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The authority under this subsection may not be used to purchase supplies for resale.

"(3) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—In this subsection, the term 'qualified organization' means a relief or disaster assistance organization as described in section 309 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5152)."

SEC. 3. DUTY OF USERS REGARDING USE OF FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULES.

Section 502 of title 40, United States Code, as amended by section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) DUTY OF USERS REGARDING USE OF SUPPLY SCHEDULES.—All users of Federal supply schedules, including non-Federal users, shall use the schedules in accordance with the ordering guidance provided by the Administrator of General Services."

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO USE SUPPLY SCHEDULES FOR CERTAIN GOODS AND SERVICES.

Subsection (d)(1) of section 502 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting "to facilitate disaster preparedness or response," after "Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)".

SEC. 5. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide increased access to the Federal supply schedules of the General Services Administration to the American Red Cross, other qualified organizations, and State and local governments.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, from Hurricane Katrina to the wildfires in California to the 9/11 attacks, our country faces disasters that try our people and our ability to help them. S. 2868, the Federal Supply Schedules Usage Act of 2009, provides the necessary tools to the organizations that respond to such disasters in a more efficient and effective manner. This bill will help our country's citizens during the times when they need it most.

S. 2868 was introduced by Senator JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN on December 12, 2009, and was reported by the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs without amendment on May 17, 2010. The Senate passed S. 2868 by unanimous consent on May 24, 2010. The bill was then referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, where we worked in a bipartisan manner to get this important legislation to the House floor.

S. 2868 authorizes the Administrator of the GSA to provide for the use of the Federal supply schedules by the American National Red Cross, qualified disaster relief organizations, and State and local governments for disaster preparedness and response.

□ 1130

This bill seeks to enhance the ability of the American National Red Cross, all qualified disaster relief organizations, and State and local governments to effectively prepare for and respond to disasters by giving them the ability to purchase specific goods and services through the pre-negotiated contracts of the Federal Supply Schedules. This will save them the administrative costs of negotiating individual agreements,

and allow them to leverage the economies of scale of the Federal Government's buying power. By saving these important organizations money, more money can be put directly towards helping people.

All the disaster relief groups would be barred from the resale of any products purchased off the Schedules, and all of their purchases would be required to be in accordance with the ordering guidance of GSA.

At the end of the day, S. 2868 provides the necessary tools to organizations that help people in their most desperate times. This bill allows these essential organizations to focus their finances and resources to directly help people, instead of spending time, energy, and money negotiating for products and services at costs that are higher than the government would pay for them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2868, the Federal Supply Schedules Usage Act of 2010. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Supply Schedules Usage Act of 2010 will allow the American Red Cross and other qualified nonprofits that engage in disaster relief and preparedness to leverage the purchasing power of the Federal Government. More specifically, this bill grants the General Services Administration the authority to allow the American Red Cross and other organizations, such as the Salvation Army and Catholic Relief Services, the ability to purchase goods from the Federal Supply Schedules. There is precedence for allowing government entities, quasi-government entities, and certain private entities to buy goods and services from the Federal Supply Schedules. Over the years, Congress has given GSA statutory authority to broaden access to the Supply Schedules.

Currently, all executive agencies, the legislative branch, the District of Columbia, tribes and tribal organizations, certain foreign governments, and quasi-governmental and government chartered agencies such as the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Civil Air Patrol are eligible to use the Schedules for certain purposes or under certain circumstances.

When this bill came over from the Senate, it was limited to the American Red Cross. But during our committee markup, I offered an amendment expanding S. 2868 to make all qualified nonprofit organizations, nationwide and local, eligible to purchase from the Federal Supply Schedules.

My district, Louisiana's Second Congressional District, located in New Orleans, was devastated by Hurricane Katrina in 2005. In the wake of the hurricane, I observed the multitude of nonprofit organizations beyond the

American Red Cross that provided disaster relief to the city.

In addition to widely recognized national organizations, local relief organizations are also invaluable. They have on-the-ground knowledge of the greatest local needs and how to fulfill those needs. Under the Stafford Act, contracts for disaster relief are to be awarded to local contractors to the extent possible. That is why I introduced my amendment to extend access to the Federal Supply Schedules to these local organizations.

After the tragic earthquake in Haiti, The New York Times listed at least 41 large-scale disaster relief organizations to which Americans could contribute. These organizations were filling a multitude of roles in Haiti and supporting the U.S. Government's presence there. They also should be eligible to purchase goods and services from the Schedules. My amendment and the bill in its entirety received unanimous support in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2868.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2868, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HEREDITARY BREAST AND OVARIAN CANCER WEEK AND NATIONAL PREVIVOR DAY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1522) expressing support for designation of the last week of September as National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and the last Wednesday of September as National Previvor Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1522

Whereas it is estimated that 750,000 people in the United States carry a gene mutation that causes a predisposition to breast and ovarian cancer;

Whereas approximately 5 to 7 percent of breast cancer and 10 to 14 percent of ovarian cancers are hereditary;

Whereas women with these mutations have up to an 84 percent chance of developing breast cancer in their lifetime;

Whereas women with a BRCA genetic mutation have up to a 50 percent lifetime risk of developing ovarian cancer;

Whereas the single greatest ovarian cancer risk factor is a family history of the disease;

Whereas hereditary cancers are often more aggressive than other cancers and occur at a

younger age, when people are less likely to undergo cancer screening;

Whereas breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer death in women under the age of 54;

Whereas ovarian cancer is the leading cause of gynecologic cancer death;

Whereas individuals with a hereditary risk for cancer require different cancer screening and risk management recommendations than the general population;

Whereas inherited BRCA genetic mutations are found in approximately 1 in 40 Ashkenazi Jews and mutations have been found in people of every ethnic group;

Whereas more than one-third of Jewish women diagnosed with ovarian cancer or primary peritoneal cancer at any age, or breast cancer before age 40, carry an inherited BRCA mutation;

Whereas African-Americans and Hispanic Americans are less likely to have access to hereditary cancer information and appropriate health care;

Whereas children of parents with an inherited predisposition to breast and ovarian cancer have a 50 percent chance of inheriting the predisposition;

Whereas among many in the cancer community, a "previvor" is a survivor of a predisposition (or increased risk) to cancer;

Whereas genetic counseling and genetic testing can determine if an individual is at high risk for breast or ovarian cancer;

Whereas raising awareness of hereditary cancer and knowledge of a genetic predisposition can directly lead to preventive strategies that can reduce the chance of dying from cancer;

Whereas the last week of September would be an appropriate week to designate as National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week; and

Whereas the last Wednesday in September would be an appropriate date to designate as National Previvor Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week; and

(2) supports the designation of National Previvor Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1522, expressing support for National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and National Previvor Day. This resolution will help to raise awareness of the risk of these aggressive cancers.

Many Americans are at risk of developing these cancers over the course of their lifetimes, and the risk is even greater for those who are genetically predisposed to contract them. As the resolution notes, hereditary cancers

can be more aggressive than other forms of cancer, and people may develop them at younger ages, when they are less likely to undergo cancer screening. If cancer is diagnosed early, chances of surviving it can increase. I am pleased to join my colleagues to encourage early screening.

House Resolution 1522 was introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, on July 15, 2010, and was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. It comes to the floor today with the support of over 80 cosponsors. I thank the gentlewoman, and would like to note that her tenacity in battling and surviving breast cancer should inspire all of us to work as hard as she did to preserve our health.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 1522.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this one hits close to home. I lost my mother to cancer at a very young age, to breast cancer. My father a few months ago was diagnosed with colon cancer. Difficult to watch and to see. But I rise today in strong support of this House Resolution 1522, expressing support for the designation of the last week of September as National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and the last Wednesday of September as the National Previvor Day.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my colleague from Florida who introduced this resolution not only as a Member of Congress, but as a cancer survivor and a previvor herself. For her courage and example, we appreciate it. I also thank Chairman CLAY for his leadership and the ability to work together and to bring this resolution to the floor.

□ 1140

This resolution gives this body an opportunity to raise awareness of hereditary cancers of all kinds, informing as many people as we can of the possibility that they or a loved one may have a genetic predisposition for cancer that can lead to preventive strategies that may significantly reduce the chance of an individual dying from cancer.

Even though it was before my allotted age of 50 when I was supposed to do some screening, I recently went and got a colonoscopy. I will spare you the details of that procedure, but I can tell you that it is well worth it to not only have the peace of mind but to do the responsible thing for our families and get checked for these types of cancers that can go undetected with, really, no symptoms. I am glad I did it, and I am grateful for the medical practices that we have in this country to be able to do that.

Mr. Speaker, an astounding number of women in this country, approxi-

mately one in eight, will suffer from breast cancer at some point during their lives. This year alone, an estimated 209,000 women will be diagnosed with the potentially deadly ailment. While the number of deaths attributed to breast cancer has declined since 1990, roughly 40,000 women are still expected to die this year from the disease. Breast cancer is the leading cause of death in women under the age of 54. When my mother passed away, she was only 52 years old.

Mr. Speaker, while not as common as it is in women, let us not forget about the men who also will suffer from breast cancer. While less than 1 percent of new breast cancer cases are found in men, this number was still almost 2,000 in the year 2008.

Along with breast cancer, ovarian cancer poses another major medical threat to women in this country. Each year in the United States, over 21,000 women are diagnosed with ovarian cancer and approximately 15,000 die from the disease. Ovarian cancer accounts for roughly 3 percent of cancer diagnoses in women in the United States. It is the ninth most common cancer among women. The greatest risk factor is family history of the disease.

Mr. Speaker, approximately three-quarters of a million people in this country are carriers for a gene mutation that causes a predisposition to breast and ovarian cancer. Women that have one of these mutations face nearly an 84 percent chance of suffering from breast cancer at some point during their lives.

Furthermore, women who have the BRCA genetic mutation have up to a 50 percent chance of developing ovarian cancer. Roughly 5 to 7 percent of breast cancer and 10 to 14 percent of ovarian cancer cases are hereditary. More than one-third of Jewish women diagnosed with ovarian or primary cancer at any age or diagnosed with breast cancer before age 40 have been found to be the carriers of the inherited BRCA mutation.

Mr. Speaker, the other purposes of this resolution is to recognize those known as previvors. According to the nonprofit organization FORCE, cancer previvors are "individuals who are survivors of a predisposition to cancer but who haven't had the disease." These individuals have a known predisposition for cancer such as a family history or hereditary genetic mutation and must live with a unique set of emotional and medical issues. Previvors are forced to make extraordinarily difficult medical management decisions throughout their lives, the likes most of us will never know.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend my colleague from Florida for introducing this resolution. I applaud her brave fight against breast cancer and for her continued campaign to increase cancer awareness and to combat this horrific disease.

I urge all Members to join me in strong support of House Resolution

1522, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. I want to thank my colleague from Utah for promoting an awareness of cancer screening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chief sponsor of this legislation, and one of the most courageous colleagues we have because she is a survivor, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Chairman CLAY, for your very kind remarks.

Congressman CHAFFETZ, thank you very much for taking the lead on your side of the aisle. Let me just express the grief that I know you felt for the loss of your mother. I have shared that grief with so many women since I shared my own personal story, and hopefully the resolution that we have today will raise awareness so that we can continue to catch more cancer earlier so that we can have more survivors in the United States.

Let me also commiserate with you on the pre-50 experience that I had for a colonoscopy, which wasn't any fun, but is absolutely necessary. Thank you for mentioning that too, although we all will spare the gory details for everyone. Suffice it to say that it's not a fun experience, but one that is very necessary.

But I rise today to offer H. Res. 1522, expressing support for designation of the last week of September, this year being the week of September 26, as National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and the last Wednesday of September as National Previvor Day.

Of all the cancers that affect women, roughly 10 percent of cases are caused by genetic factors. Though this percentage is relatively small, the risk for this group, as you have just heard, is huge.

Women with hereditary risk factors for breast cancer carry an 85 percent lifetime risk of developing the disease. For ovarian cancer, most women have about a 1.5 percent lifetime chance of developing the disease. But for those with hereditary risk factors, that chance can be as high as 50 percent, and as I learned almost 3 years ago, I am one of those women.

Together with my colleagues and inspirational organizations, including Facing Our Risk of Cancer Empowered, or FORCE; Bright Pink; and the Young Survival Coalition, this resolution gives a voice to these women and brings awareness to the risks of hereditary cancer and, as I have said many times and as so many of my colleagues have said on the floor many times, knowledge is power.

Hereditary cancer syndrome describes an inherited gene mutation that increases the risk for one or more types of cancer. The main hereditary breast and ovarian syndromes are caused by mutations in one of two genes, BRCA1 or BRCA2—I am a BRCA2 carrier—which substantially increase the risk for breast and ovarian

cancer and slightly increase the risk for other kinds of cancers.

For women with a hereditary risk of cancer, it often strikes at an earlier age when they are less likely to expect it, but when the cancer is often more aggressive and more deadly. These young women with a heightened genetic risk are known as previvors, individuals who are survivors of a predisposition to cancer, but who haven't yet had the disease.

I was 41 when I discovered that I had breast cancer. Because my cancer was discovered so early, I may have only needed minimal treatment. However, as an Ashkenazi Jewish woman, as a woman of Eastern European Jewish descent, I was at a higher risk of carrying a BRCA mutation, and my early cancer set off warning bells for my doctors.

At the time, I did not know of my increased risk for carrying the BRCA gene mutation, but I was fortunate that once diagnosed with breast cancer, I had access to experts that helped me learn more about what the BRCA gene mutation meant for me. Genetic testing confirmed the worst. Unfortunately, I had hereditary cancer which dramatically increased my chances of a recurrence of breast cancer and getting ovarian cancer as well. Facing my disease, I have become both a survivor and a previvor.

As a mother of three beautiful children, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make sure that I would be around to see them grow up. I faced tough choices, but seven major surgeries later, I have dramatically reduced the chances that my own cancer will come back.

Fortunately, there are organizations like FORCE, Bright Pink and the Young Survival Coalition that support young women as previvors and as survivors of cancer. These organizations bring essential awareness to these issues and help women at risk by providing the information, support and the voice they need to help survive their hereditary risk. As I said before, knowledge is power.

It is also why, with the help of 377 cosponsors in the House, I filed the Breast Cancer Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act, known as the EARLY Act, to bring this message of knowledge and awareness to the forefront of the story about cancer. I am proud that the EARLY Act is now the law of the land.

With the odds stacked against them, young previvors need to know their risks. It is our responsibility to empower these women to know their bodies, speak up about their health, and work together to wipe out these deadly diseases.

I believe this resolution will help in that effort. National Previvor Day and Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week, which bridges September's Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month and October's Breast Cancer Awareness Month, will bring added public awareness to the risks for genetic cancers. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in support of H. Res. 1522.

Mr. Speaker, let me just add, before I close, that I am thrilled to see that our colleague from Connecticut, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, who is an ovarian cancer survivor, has joined us on the floor in support of this resolution.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have any additional speakers.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KILROY).

□ 1150

Ms. KILROY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1522, which expresses support for the designation of National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and National Previvor Day. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution which will raise critical awareness about hereditary cancers and increase knowledge about genetic predispositions which may put some individuals at particular risk.

And just as an aside, I just want to take note that when we passed our health care bill, we made it much more likely that people will get the information to find out about whether they have a genetic predisposition. Without that health care bill which would prohibit discrimination on the basis of an existing condition, many women and men would be afraid to learn more about their genetic histories. But this is critically important information about how you would be able to address certain signs and symptoms and heighten awareness about your particular situation.

We all know someone who has been diagnosed with cancer, and we understand the devastating impact that the diagnosis can have on patients and loved ones. I have been through it with my family, with a very close person in my family with respect to ovarian cancer, and my husband's young cousin is struggling with breast cancer right now. One in two men and one in three women will develop cancer in their lifetime, and in 2010 alone, nearly 1.5 million Americans will be diagnosed with cancer.

Although we have made great strides in recent years in finding new treatments, we must support efforts to find the genetic mutations that increase the likelihood that some people will develop cancer in their lifetimes. We need to work on cures. We need to work on treatments. But finding causes is critically important as well.

We also must encourage everyone to know as much as they can about their own family histories so they can work with their physicians and get the necessary and timely screenings as early as possible. Hereditary cancer can strike at a younger age.

I appreciate this opportunity, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of declaring the last week of September to be National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and the last Wednesday of September to be National Previvor Day.

I want to thank my colleagues who have spoken this morning and all of whom have dealt in some way with the issue of breast cancer, ovarian cancer, or maybe some other form of cancer. It is probably the worst day of your life when you are given a cancer diagnosis. You are not listening to what any doctor says. You are only consumed with understanding whether or not you are going to live or die or what is going to happen to your family if such a death should occur.

After heart disease, cancer is still the second-leading cause of death in America, and breast cancer the most common cancer diagnosis. In 2006, over 40,000 women died from this disease. Ovarian cancer, meanwhile, is the fifth most common cancer among women. Close to 14,000 of our friends and family are expected to perish from ovarian cancer this year.

Perhaps the saddest thing about these grim numbers is that some of these deaths are readily preventable. Thanks to modern science, we now know much more about the genetic and hereditary precursors of these cancers and can identify the women most at risk, the previvors that are predisposed to develop them. We also know that women who catch their ovarian cancer at an earlier stage are over three times more likely to survive the disease than those who do not. Sadly, over 60 percent of the women diagnosed with ovarian cancer between 1999 and 2006 fell into this latter category.

Similarly, women diagnosed with breast cancer early are more than four times more likely to survive the disease than women diagnosed at a later stage. And yet one in five women over age 50 have not had a mammogram in the past 2 years.

We have worked to address these troubling statistics with the preventive care reforms in the Affordable Care Act. But there is no substitute for awareness, and that is why I strongly support this resolution and encourage all women, and particularly previvors with a genetic predisposition for those cancers, to get tested early and get tested often.

Twenty-four years ago, it was an early diagnosis of ovarian cancer that saved my life. It was accidental. It should not be accidental. People should not survive by accident.

It is so critically important that this resolution pass. We can save. We can save women, and we save women and we save their families. And I urge my colleagues. I was lucky. My life was given back to me and gave me a second chance. Let's give our families, the women in this country, a first chance and a second chance to survive. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge us all to support and pass this important resolution. This is something that should truly unite us in this fight. We continue to build awareness and encourage people to get checked. And our hearts and prayers go out to those loved ones who are suffering from this, but there is great hope.

I urge my colleagues to get behind this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank my colleagues—the gentlewomen from Florida, Ohio, and Connecticut—for lending their voice to this issue and raising the level of awareness throughout this country as far as the dreaded disease of cancer is concerned.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1522.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

OVERSEAS CONTRACTOR REFORM ACT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5366) to require the proposal for debarment from contracting with the Federal Government of persons violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Overseas Contractor Reform Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO PROPOSE FOR DEBARMENT PERSONS VIOLATING THE FOREIGN CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROPOSE FOR DEBARMENT.—Unless waived by the head of a Federal agency under subsection (b), any person found to be in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 shall be proposed for debarment from any contract or grant awarded by the Federal Government within 30 days after a final judgment of such violation.

(b) WAIVER.—The head of a Federal agency may waive this section for a Federal contract or grant. Any such waiver shall be reported to Congress by the head of the agency concerned within 30 days from the date of the waiver, along with an accompanying justification.

(c) FINAL JUDGMENT.—For purposes of this section, a judgment becomes final when all appeals of the judgment have been finally determined, or all time for filing such appeals has expired.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term “contract” means a binding agreement entered into by a Federal agency for the purpose of obtaining property or services.

(2) PERSON.—The term “person” includes—

(A) an individual;

(B) a partnership; and

(C) a corporation.

(3) FOREIGN CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT OF 1977.—The term “Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977” means—

(A) section 30A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78dd-1); and

(B) sections 104 and 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 78dd-2).

SEC. 3. GOVERNMENTAL POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States Government that no Government contracts or grants should be awarded to individuals or companies who violate the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, contractors have been tarnishing the name of our good country by bribing foreign officials with the very tax dollars our country pays them. In our effort to win the hearts and minds of the people of foreign countries, we must show that we take integrity and honesty seriously. As such, we must take action against those contractors who hinder our efforts and inappropriately utilize the money we pay them. H.R. 5366, the Overseas Contractor Reform Act, will provide the government with the means to appropriately respond to those contractors.

H.R. 5366 was introduced by my colleague, Representative PETER WELCH, on May 20, 2010, and referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, where we worked hard to get this important legislation to the House floor.

This bill requires that any person convicted of violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 be proposed for debarment from any further contracts or grants with the Federal Government within 30 days after final judgment of the violation. The bill defines “final judgment” as occurring when all appeals of the judgment have been determined or all the time for filing such appeals has expired, so there is no question regarding the person's guilt.

Additionally, this bill authorizes the head of a Federal agency to issue a waiver, allowing contracts or grants to be awarded to the contractors, but the agency head must justify the decision and report the waiver and accompanying justification to Congress within 30 days.

□ 1200

This bill also makes it Federal policy that no more contracts or grants should be awarded to any individuals or companies who violate the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. This policy statement sends a strong message to all that such waste, fraud, and abuse will not be tolerated.

This bill helps fight waste of tax dollars, protects the image of the country, and helps ensure fair play in competition for contracts. H.R. 5366 is a common sense, good government bill, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5366, the Overseas Contractor Reform Act. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform over the years has uncovered numerous instances in which government continued doing business with bad actors. This legislation will augment the U.S. government's efforts to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in contracting. It will ensure that we are awarding contracts and grants only to parties with integrity.

The bill requires a Federal agency to propose for debarment from receiving any new grants or contracts a person or entity found in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977.

The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act makes it a crime to offer a bribe to a foreign official for the purpose of obtaining or retaining business from a foreign government.

Since the passage of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, the fraud section of the Department of Justice has prosecuted individuals and entities accused of bribing foreign officials. These parties are now subject to fines, and although proposed debarment was already a possible consequence, this bill sends the message that Congress, without question, desires agencies to take administrative action against parties convicted of violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

This bill also provides agencies with a modicum of flexibility. If the agency head finds it is in the best interest of the government to waive the requirement for proposed debarment, a waiver is permissible. However, the agency head must report the waiver to Congress and provide a justification.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5366.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5366, the Overseas Contracting Reform Act, which provides an important and necessary recourse for our government when

contractors violate federal law. Specifically, the legislation requires the automatic proposal for debarment of any contractor found to be in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, FCPA, which prohibits American companies and individuals from unlawfully influencing foreign officials.

I commend the sponsor of this legislation, Representative PETER WELCH of Vermont, for his work on this matter. Since the brutal shooting incident at Baghdad's Nisour Square in which guards employed by the private security contractor Blackwater Worldwide, now Xe Services, allegedly shot and killed 17 innocent and unarmed Iraqi civilians, I have worked to bring such contractors within the purview of U.S. law and to hold them accountable for their actions. Unfortunately, even after the Blackwater shooting gained considerable public attention, reports indicated that not only did contractors remain a significant part of the U.S. presence in Iraq and Afghanistan, but they also continued to serve in inappropriate roles such as conducting interrogations of suspected terrorists. All the while, the laws which govern them remain vague.

As many of my colleagues and I have noted for several years, there is an egregious lack of both accountability and transparency for such firms and their employees. Although the Federal Acquisition Regulation, FAR, enables government officials to initiate suspension and debarment proceedings where the contractor has committed an offense "that seriously and directly affects the present responsibility of a government contractor or subcontractor," among other things, no official used this authority to initiate such proceedings with Blackwater. Moreover, as a recent Senate Armed Services Committee investigation underscores, Blackwater was able to secure new contracts by creating several dozen subsidiaries for the sole purpose of concealing its parent companies' identity. Contracting officers claim they weren't even aware that they were awarding contracts to a company under Blackwater's control.

It is clear that the existence of authority to debar under the FAR is, in itself, insufficient to trigger debarment proceedings, perhaps because agency officials are unwilling to initiate debarment proceedings even when just cause is shown. That is why H.R. 5366 is an important piece of legislation. It will provide that companies automatically be proposed for debarment if they are found to be in violation of the FCPA. The Department of Justice is investigating whether Blackwater employees bribed Iraqi officials to allow them to continue doing business in Iraq, an obvious violation of the FCPA. Under H.R. 5366, if Blackwater is found guilty, the firm will automatically be proposed for debarment.

Mr. Speaker, all loopholes for private security contractors working overseas should have been closed long ago. Contractors and their employees must be held accountable for their actions overseas, especially during war time. This is not just important for the America's reputation for upholding justice and the rule of law, but for the safety and security of our troops and civilians serving overseas. Failing to do so undermines American national security interests. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 5366.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in today's wars, military contractors play a larger role than ever before. As we have seen over the

past decade, our laws have been inadequate to curb what became a free-for-all for contractors overseas. That is why I support efforts like this one, to define and reign in unacceptable and damaging contractor abuses.

In my own state of Oregon, 26 Oregon National Guardsmen have filed suit against war contractor KBR, formerly a subsidiary of Halliburton, alleging that KBR personnel knew a highly toxic chemical was present at Iraqi facilities in 2003, but that they waited months before bringing it to the attention of the U.S. military. By that time, unsuspecting members of the Oregon, Indiana, and West Virginia National Guard had already been exposed.

Even more troubling, if KBR is found to be at fault the company may never have to pay for its actions. A still-classified clause in KBR's contract may result in the U.S. Army—and U.S. taxpayers—paying for the harm done by contractors.

This is just one instance of past contractor actions having continued repercussions today. I will continue to work for swift congressional action that will hold contractors accountable, strengthen oversight and protect both our troops and the taxpayers.

I strongly support Mr. WELCH's efforts here today, and those who help tackle this problem on behalf of our brave men and women in uniform.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5366.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1612) expressing the support for and honoring September 17, 2010 as "Constitution Day".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1612

Whereas the Constitution of the United States was signed on September 17, 1787, by 39 delegates from 12 States;

Whereas the Constitution was subsequently ratified by each of the original 13 States;

Whereas the Constitution was drafted in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for the citizens of the United States;

Whereas the Constitution has provided the means and structure for this Nation and its citizens that is unparalleled by any other country;

Whereas the Constitution's contributions to the welfare of the human race reach far beyond the borders of the United States;

Whereas the House of Representatives continues to strive to preserve and strengthen the values and rights bestowed by the Constitution upon the United States and its citizens;

Whereas the Constitution is recognized by many to be the most significant and important document in history for establishing freedom and justice through democracy;

Whereas the Constitution deserves the recognition, respect, and reverence of all people in the United States;

Whereas every person in the United States should celebrate the freedom and responsibilities of the Constitution;

Whereas the preservation of such values and rights in the hearts and minds of United States citizens would be advanced by official recognition of the signing of the Constitution; and

Whereas September 17, 2010, is designated as "Constitution Day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports "Constitution Day"; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is no exaggeration to say that the United States Constitution is one of the most important documents in history. Its framework for our representative and democratic system of government has served the American people well for over two centuries, making it the oldest federal constitution still in use in the world. Its separation of powers, checks and balances, and preservation of rights has been an example to burgeoning democracies everywhere. I think that all Americans should take time to read and study the Constitution. The values and principles it enshrines are central to our Nation's identity.

House Resolution 1612 was introduced on September 14, 2010, by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA). It enjoys the bipartisan support of 50 cosponsors. And I am sure that my colleagues will agree that it is a privilege for us to serve in this Chamber, serving, protecting, and defending the United States Constitution. I am glad that we are taking the opportunity

today to honor that most treasured document.

In closing, let us all be sure to keep the principles of the Constitution in our hearts and on our minds every day as we continue to work for a more perfect union.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1612, expressing support for and honoring September 17, 2010 as "Constitution Day."

Madam Speaker, I would first like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), for introducing this bipartisan resolution for the second year in a row. It serves as an important reminder of the ideals and principles contained within a document that we have all sworn to uphold and protect.

Madam Speaker, Friday marks the 223rd anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America. On September 17, 1787, 12 State delegations, comprising a total of 39 delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, signed a historic document that has guided our Nation for centuries. While this concluded the Constitutional Convention, the Constitution didn't truly take effect until New Hampshire became the ninth State to ratify it on June 21, 1788.

At some 4,400 words, the Constitution is not only the shortest charter of government for any major country in the world, but also the oldest. Madam Speaker, it is truly remarkable that a document authored over two centuries ago has been able to stand the test of time and continues to provide a foundation for our Nation even to this day.

I encourage every American to take time this Friday to celebrate and remember the freedoms and values contained within this document that sadly we have all too often taken for granted.

Madam Speaker, it is truly an honor and privilege to be able to speak on the floor of the House of Representatives about the Constitution, and I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side, and I continue to reserve.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, we have two additional speakers, but at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the prime sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his kind words. I am honored to rise today in support of House Resolution 1612, which honors our United States Constitution on September 17 as Constitution Day.

You know, in the not-too-recent past, too few people in this country knew what was in this document. As the gentleman has previously said, it is about 4,400 words. That is all there is, 4,400 words. But I think over the last couple of years, more and more people are turning to it to find out exactly what is in here and how this place operates and how this country operates. And I think it is important. I have always been a student of history, and I think it is important to know where we came from in order to know where we are going. I think it is important that folks recognize September 17, that they should sit down and just start leafing through the Constitution.

□ 1210

I know this coming Friday, when we are all back in our districts again, I'm going to be back in my district talking at a school. From there, I'm going to go to a university in my district and talk about the Constitution and what it means to us. I think it's important that people know what it is because, again, as I said, people have got to understand how we are and why we are the way we are.

As the gentleman has said, this document has been in existence for 223 years from September 17. As just a little bit of background on how we got here, James Madison, when he was still in Virginia, really understood that the Articles of Confederation weren't working in this country. There was a dispute that was going on, and they wanted to really get something worked out with Maryland, so they kind of sat down and came up with an idea of having some kind of a get-together, a meeting, in Philadelphia.

The question really was at that time: Were they going to, A, just look at the Articles of Confederation and try to amend those, which is what a lot of the delegates who attended thought they were doing, or, as Madison thought, were they really going to sit down and bring forth a great new document that would get us past that trying time in our country's history and move us forward?

There was great debate, because as they assembled in 1787, in May of that year, and as the delegates were coming in from around the country from 13 States, in the debate, they were saying, Well, we should be doing this or we shouldn't be doing that because we're only supposed to be here for the Articles of Confederation; but folks really started sitting down and looking at the issue.

As they were looking at this, more and more people came to the conclusion which Madison had, and he had gone there prepared. It's amazing what he had done if you look at his background and what Madison was, but he went there. He had gone through the ancient charters, going back to Greece, to Rome, going across the world; and he looked at the best that was there at that time that they could examine. He

brought those things with him, and then the debates began.

The great thing about it was there were debates, and there was open discussion, but the open discussion was only amongst the members because, during that time, they said, you know, We do not want this to get out, so they actually closed the doors and shut the windows. Now, you've got to remember that this was one of the hottest years that they had had on record for a summer in Philadelphia. They closed the windows. They posted a guard at the door, and they didn't want anybody to know what the discussions were. Everybody was under pretty much an oath of secrecy that they would not go out and discuss what was being said in there at that time. We would know it today as a complete press blackout.

Though some of the members got disgruntled, they went home. Some of them came back, but some of them just said, You know what? I'm fed up with this. We shouldn't be doing what we're doing, and they left. Yet the ones who stuck it out are the ones to whom we owe our being where we are today.

You start looking at this document and the people that presided over that Constitutional Convention—you know, George Washington being the presiding officer, and then there also was a deputy from Virginia. You look at some other individuals—Alexander Hamilton from New York, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, Governor Morris of Pennsylvania, of course James Madison, who we all know is the Father of our Constitution. These individuals made sure that they put forth a document that we would have and hold so dear to us today.

There were a lot of people at that time from around the world who were still looking at this fledgling country and asking, Can it really exist? Can it survive? But this little document, these 4,400 words, showed the world who we were as Americans and what we stood for.

Now, there was a lot of conflict, and there were a lot of things on which they could not come to a resolution during that time—slavery was one of them—but they hoped at some point in time that Americans would come to a resolution on that. As we saw this document progress during that time. On September 17, 1787, they finally came to a resolution, and they signed the document.

It's interesting because it's reported that, when Benjamin Franklin left Constitution Hall, a woman met him outside. She asked—and I'm paraphrasing—Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? He said to her in reply, A republic if you can keep it.

So, for these past 223 years in this country, it has been important that every generation read this document to understand who we are and why we want to preserve it. It is so important, in my opinion, that on September 17, this coming week, that we honor the Constitution with Constitution Day. I

would urge everyone to sit down, to pick up their little pocket Constitutions, to just read them, and to thank those individuals. In my opinion, the good Lord gave us such a small window of time, and He put so many great minds in one room to give this great document.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate this 223rd anniversary of the Constitution.

Over two centuries ago, 39 Founding Fathers signed a document that established a framework for the free and brave society that we have in this United States of America. It was in the late 18th century when the 13 colonies were suffering from heavy trade regulations and increasing taxes, with revenues being sent back to war-ravaged England. American colonists were exasperated by what could only be explained today as taxation without representation.

It was John Adams who then described the months that followed as the greatest single effort of national deliberation the world had ever seen, for our Founding Fathers made the first modern attempt at a republican democracy in human history. These brave visionaries succeeded in designing a government that would be the model of the free world right up until the current day.

See, our newly ratified Constitution posed a challenge to the age-old political belief, and that was equally distributed powers between three branches of government to create a limited form of government with checks and balances and to facilitate that the States and the people would retain all other power and authority not specifically delegated to those in Washington. It was James Madison, the author of the Constitution, who considered it the tools necessary to enable a government to control the governed but, in the same breath and the next place, to oblige it to control itself.

You know, unfortunately, the intrinsic values which made our country the prosperous Nation that it is today have been threatened since the Constitution's signing. Our Supreme Court, across the street, once called the guardians of the Constitution by Alexander Hamilton, have removed broad constitutional protections, which have vastly expanded the powers of the Federal Government. Big Government politicians in this legislative and executive branch have created so many new government bureaucracies that our annual

Federal spending right now has surpassed 37 percent of GDP. With these and more, the strict constitutional guidelines that our Founding Fathers put in place are now severely in jeopardy.

As a United States Congressman and founder also as I am of the Constitution Caucus here in Washington, my goal always has been to keep the Constitution in the forefront in modern-day politics, though, without its influence, we do not possess the groundwork needed to keep our country strong and free as we all desire.

It was Abraham Lincoln who famously said, Don't interfere with any of the Constitution. It is the only safeguard for our liberties. Well, I promise to keep that essential document integrated into our power policy decisions—any one that I make—and I look forward to keeping that shining city on the hill as our Founding Fathers created on this day 223 years ago.

I thank you all, and may God bless America.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers. I would just urge my colleagues to please get behind us in support. This is something that, again, should unite us. The beauty and the profound nature of the Constitution, the very first three words of "we the people," this is something that is so profound and inspired within this Nation. I just urge all of my colleagues to get behind us and to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, in closing, I thank my colleague from Ohio for bringing this legislation to the attention of the body, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1612.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1220

MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING ACT OF 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (S. 3656) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to improve the reporting on sales of livestock and dairy products, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3656

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 260 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1636i) is amended by striking "September 30, 2010" and inserting "September 30, 2015".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION.—Section 942 of the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1635 note; Public Law 106-78) is amended by striking "September 30, 2010" and inserting "September 30, 2015".

(b) WHOLESALE PORK CUTS.—

(1) REPORTING.—Chapter 3 of subtitle B of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635i et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 233. MANDATORY REPORTING OF WHOLESALE PORK CUTS.

"(a) REPORTING.—The corporate officers or officially designated representatives of each packer shall report to the Secretary information concerning the price and volume of wholesale pork cuts, as the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate.

"(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish information reported under subsection (a) as the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate."

(2) NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a negotiated rulemaking process pursuant to subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to negotiate and develop a proposed rule to implement the amendment made by paragraph (1).

(3) NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—

(A) REPRESENTATION.—Any negotiated rulemaking committee established by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to paragraph (2) shall include representatives from—

(i) organizations representing swine producers;

(ii) organizations representing packers of pork, processors of pork, retailers of pork, and buyers of wholesale pork;

(iii) the Department of Agriculture; and

(iv) among interested parties that participate in swine or pork production.

(B) INAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—Any negotiated rulemaking committee established by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to paragraph (2) shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(4) TIMING OF PROPOSED AND FINAL RULES.—In carrying out the negotiated rulemaking process under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that—

(A) any recommendation for a proposed rule or report is provided to the Secretary of Agriculture not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) a final rule is promulgated not later than one and a half years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PORK EXPORT REPORTING.—Section 602(a)(1) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5712(a)(1)) is amended by striking "cotton," and inserting "cotton, pork,".

SEC. 3. DAIRY MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) **ELECTRONIC REPORTING REQUIRED.**—Subsection (d) of section 273 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1637b) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **ELECTRONIC REPORTING.**—

“(1) **ELECTRONIC REPORTING SYSTEM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary shall establish an electronic reporting system to carry out this section.

“(2) **PUBLICATION.**—Not later than 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time on the Wednesday of each week, the Secretary shall publish a report containing the information obtained under this section for the preceding week.”.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall implement the electronic reporting system required by subsection (d) of section 273 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1637b), as amended by subsection (a). Until the electronic reporting system is implemented, the Secretary shall continue to conduct mandatory dairy product information reporting under the authority of such section, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, S. 3656.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2010 will authorize for 5 years the mandatory price reporting programs run by the United States Department of Agriculture. This act requires sales information to be reported and published in a timely fashion, allowing livestock buyers and sellers to make more informed decisions.

The Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2010 adds mandatory reporting for wholesale pork cuts and pork exports. It also requires USDA to establish an electronic reporting system for dairy products so that price information is made available more quickly.

Madam Speaker, reauthorizing mandatory price reporting programs provides producers with the transparent, accurate and timely market information they need. I urge passage of the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2010.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, S. 3656, the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2010, is a straightforward, 5-year reauthorization of a program that began with passage of the original legislation in 1999. The original act came as a result of many months of negotiations between a

broad array of industry participants and required packers to report livestock purchase prices to USDA's Agriculture Marketing Service. Both producers and packers agree that mandatory price reporting plays an important role in transparent, accurate and timely decision-making for participants in today's livestock markets.

This program was last reauthorized during the 109th Congress. As with that original legislation and subsequent reauthorizations or amendments, S. 3656 represents a consensus view of many producer and packer interests with a direct stake in the reporting program. Anyone familiar with animal agriculture knows how challenging it can be to have this many competing interests—from producers to processors—achieve an agreement.

S. 3656 will make some small changes to the existing reporting program. First, reporting of wholesale pork cuts will be required for the first time. The details of this new rule will be worked out in the rulemaking process. Second, there will now be reporting on a weekly basis of pork exports. Finally, the legislation directs the Secretary to implement an electronic system of dairy price reporting in the absence of an appropriation for this purpose.

Companion legislation, H.R. 5852, passed the House Agriculture Committee on July 28. Since mandatory price reporting expires on September 30, it is timely that we are acting today. I advocate passage of the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this very timely and needed bill to modernize our marketing system and to bring transparency to our buyers and purchasers within our livestock industry and within the animal agriculture industry. It is important for our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3656.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERINARIAN SERVICES INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3519) to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to establish a grant program to promote efforts to develop, implement, and sustain veterinary services, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterinarian Services Investment Act”.

SEC. 2. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1415A (7 U.S.C. 3151a) the following new section:

“SEC. 1415B. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **COMPETITIVE GRANTS.**—The Secretary shall carry out a program to make competitive grants to qualified entities that engage in activities described in paragraph (2) for the purpose of developing, implementing, and sustaining veterinary services.

“(2) **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.**—To be eligible for a grant under this subsection, a qualified entity must carry out programs or activities that the Secretary determines will—

“(A) substantially relieve veterinarian shortage situations;

“(B) support or facilitate private veterinary practices engaged in public health activities; or

“(C) support or facilitate practices of veterinarians who are participating in or have successfully completed a service requirement under section 1415A(a)(2).

“(b) **AWARD PROCESSES AND PREFERENCES.**—

“(1) **APPLICATION, EVALUATION, AND INPUT PROCESSES.**—In administering the grant program under this section, the Secretary shall use an appropriate application and evaluation process and seek the input of interested persons.

“(2) **GRANT PREFERENCES.**—In the case of grants to be used for any of the purposes described in paragraphs (2) through (6) of subsection (c), the Secretary shall give a preference to the selection of qualified entities that document coordination between or with other qualified entities regarding the applicable purpose.

“(3) **ADDITIONAL PREFERENCES.**—When awarding grants under this section, the Secretary may develop additional preferences by taking into account the amount of funds available for grants as well as the purposes for which the grant funds will be used.

“(4) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.**—Sections 1413B, 1462(a), 1469(a)(3), 1469(c), and 1470 shall apply to the administration of the grant program under this section.

“(c) **USE OF GRANTS TO RELIEVE VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATIONS AND SUPPORT VETERINARY SERVICES.**—Funds provided by grants under this section may be used for the following purposes to relieve veterinarian shortage situations and support veterinary services:

“(1) Grants to assist veterinarians with establishing or expanding practices for the purpose of equipping veterinary offices, sharing in the reasonable overhead costs of such practices (as determined by the Secretary), or establishing mobile veterinary facilities where at least a portion of such facilities will address education or extension needs.

“(2) Grants to promote recruitment (including programs in secondary schools), placement, and retention of veterinarians, veterinary technicians, students of veterinary medicine, and students of veterinary technology.

“(3) Grants for veterinary students, veterinary interns, externs, fellows, and residents, and veterinary technician students to cover

expenses (other than the types of expenses listed in 1415A(c)(5)) to attend training programs in food safety or food animal medicine.

“(4) Grants establishing or expanding accredited veterinary education programs (including faculty recruitment and retention), veterinary residency and fellowship programs, or veterinary internship and externship programs in coordination with accredited colleges of veterinary medicine.

“(5) Grants for the assessment of veterinarian shortage situations and preparation of applications for designation as a shortage situation.

“(6) Grants in continuing education and extension, including tele-veterinary medicine and other distance-based education, for veterinarians, veterinary technicians, and other health professionals needed to strengthen veterinary programs and enhance food safety.

“(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN GRANTS.—

“(1) TERMS OF SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—Grants provided under this section for the purpose specified in subsection (c)(1) shall be subject to an agreement between the Secretary and the grant recipient that includes a required term of service for the recipient, as established by the Secretary. In establishing such terms, the Secretary shall consider only—

“(A) the amount of the grant awarded; and
“(B) the specific purpose of the grant.

“(2) BREACH REMEDIES.—An agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide remedies for any breach of the agreement by the grant recipient, including repayment or partial repayment of the grant funds, with interest. The Secretary may waive the repayment obligation in the event of extreme hardship or extreme need, as determined by the Secretary.

“(3) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—Funds recovered under paragraph (2) shall be credited to the account available to carry out this section and shall remain available until expended.

“(e) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) RECIPIENT SHARE.—A grant recipient shall provide matching non-Federal funds, either in cash or in-kind support, in an amount equal to not less than 50 percent of the Federal funds provided in a grant under this section.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may establish, by regulation, conditions under which the cost-sharing requirements of paragraph (1) may be reduced or waived.

“(f) PROHIBITION ON USE OF GRANT FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—Funds made available for grants under this section shall not be used for the construction of a new building or facility or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building of facility, including site grading and improvement and architect fees.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATION.—The term ‘veterinarian shortage situation’ means a veterinarian shortage situation determined by the Secretary under section 1415A(b).

“(2) QUALIFIED ENTITY.—The term ‘qualified entity’ means the following:

“(A) A for-profit or nonprofit entity located in the United States that operates a veterinary clinic providing veterinary services—

“(i) in a rural area, as defined in section 1393(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(ii) in response to a veterinarian shortage situation.

“(B) A State, national, allied, or regional veterinary organization or specialty board

recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

“(C) A college or school of veterinary medicine accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

“(D) A university research foundation or veterinary medical foundation.

“(E) A department of veterinary science or department of comparative medicine accredited by the Department of Education.

“(F) A State agricultural experiment station.

“(G) A State, local, or tribal government agency.

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this section for fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this authorization of appropriations shall remain available to the Secretary for the purposes of this section until expended.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3519.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act, which was introduced by my good friend and colleague from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH). I had the privilege to be the lead Democrat on this legislation which is vital to growing our rural communities across America and securing our Nation's food supply.

Our veterinary workforce is responsible for ensuring that the food we eat is safe, but they are facing a critical shortage in the public, private, industrial and academic sectors, and the problem is growing. Our Nation's large-animal vets are truly on the front lines of food safety, public health, animal health and national security. The demand for large-animal veterinarians is increasing, and lack of these specialists in many areas of the country will continue to put our agricultural economy and the safety of our food supply at risk.

I know firsthand how important large-animal veterinarians are to farmers and ranchers. When I left the Army, I returned to my family farm and realized that much had changed in agriculture during the 20-plus years I had served. I decided to sit down with my local veterinarian and have a discussion on the new animal health prac-

tices that science and research had given agriculture. I was lucky because in the small town of Lamoni in Decatur County we had a food animal veterinarian who I could turn to; however, many are not so lucky today. We are experiencing a shortage in large-food animal veterinarians across the country.

I have worked over the years to try and correct the shortage of livestock and large-animal veterinarians. Research has shown that the demand for large-animal veterinarians will increase by 13 percent a year, with four in every 100 positions remaining vacant.

□ 1230

With just over 250 graduates from veterinary schools going into livestock-related fields, this crisis is a problem that not only affects rural America but also our major cities. These large animal veterinarians are the first line of defense against animal disease, outbreaks that can occur and cause serious health problems. Food and animal veterinarians not only identify, treat, and prevent naturally occurring diseases but are also on the front line of agroterrorism.

For all of the reasons above, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing the Veterinarian Services Investment Act today. This legislation will authorize grants to address workforce shortages based on the needs of underserved areas. For example, grants could be used to recruit veterinarians and veterinary technicians in shortage areas and communities. It could add veterinarians expanding and establishing practices in high-need areas. It could establish mobile portable clinics and televet services and establish education programs, including continuing education, distance education, and factor recruitment in veterinary science.

Our Nation faces major challenges to relieve veterinary shortages, and the Veterinarian Services Investment Act is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since the fall of 2000, the Committee on Agriculture has worked on ways of resolving the serious veterinary shortage problem confronting many rural communities. With the passage of the National Veterinary Medical Service Act in December of 2003, a program was finally authorized to incentivize large animal veterinarians to practice in communities that USDA designated as veterinarian shortage areas. With this program in place, large animal veterinarians are able to apply on a competitive basis for educational loan repayment assistance in exchange for their commitment to practice in shortage

areas for the length of time as established by the regulations.

While it's unfortunate that it took almost 6 years for USDA to establish a final rule implementing this first step, I'm optimistic that when the first awards are issued in the coming weeks, we'll begin a slowdown and hopefully reverse this problem.

To the extent that the loan program is successful, it's important to consider that this was just the first step. While this assistance will be very helpful in attracting veterinarians to these communities, there remain gaps in veterinarian recruitment, attracting and training technical support staff, and simply meeting the long-term costs of operating veterinarian practices in these communities.

The Veterinarian Services Investment Act is meant to address these secondary needs and is designed to complement the loan repayment program to help large animal veterinarians become established in these communities.

This bill recognizes and addresses a real problem in rural America, and I'm proud to be an original cosponsor. I support this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), who has done an outstanding job of shepherding this bill through, understands the challenges in his State and in rural communities across America, and he's trying to do something.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I sincerely appreciate today's consideration of H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act. The need for skilled veterinarians has already been stated. It may not be at the forefront of debate here in Washington, but it is an issue which impacts many areas of our country and many aspects of our lives.

Our food animal veterinary workforce is on the front lines of food safety, public health, and animal health. This vital profession, however, is facing a critical shortage in the public, private, industrial, and academic sectors. To make matters worse, the problem is certainly on the rise.

Large animal veterinarians in particular are integral to small rural communities, but in many of these communities—communities with few people but with large numbers of animals—we are seeing a very distressing trend. According to the USDA, Nebraska's Cherry County, one of the top three beef production counties in the United States, has 145,000 food animals per one veterinarian.

To this end, I've introduced H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act, with Mr. BOSWELL. The legislation authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to award competitive grants to help develop, implement, and sustain veterinary services especially in identified and underserved areas.

Though we may not realize it, veterinarians make a difference every day.

They understand animals and are integral parts of our rural communities. Unfortunately, too many rural communities don't have this necessary support. This investment act will make a difference, and I urge its passage.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, just a couple of things before we close.

There are an estimated 283 million pets and 2.3 billion farm animals in our country. That's a lot of animals, FRANK, don't you think? It is. There are nearly 86,000 veterinarians in the U.S.; however, the majority of them focus on pets—cats and dogs. Twenty-eight veterinary schools in the country, and something that's very important to this legislation, veterinary graduates have an average debt of \$120,000. So I think this is something that we ought to be aware of when we think of food safety and so on. So the demand for large animal veterinarians is increasing, and the lack of these faceless in many areas of the country will continue to put our agricultural economy and the safety of our food supply at risk.

H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act, will help address this shortage and continue to ensure Americans have access to the safest, most plentiful, and most available food supply in the world. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3519, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO PAKISTANI PEOPLE AFTER FLOODS

Mr. BARROW. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1613) expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Pakistan in the aftermath of the devastating floods that began on July 22, 2010, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1613

Whereas heavy rainfall that began on July 22, 2010, and subsequent flooding throughout Pakistan have caused a humanitarian crisis of unprecedented proportions that has affected over 20,000,000 people, killing more than 1,750, injuring over 2,700, damaging or destroying upwards of 1,800,000 houses, and displacing millions of men, women, and children;

Whereas the devastation wrought by the floods has been catastrophic, submerging

one-fifth of the country and destroying critical infrastructure, farms, schools, homes, and businesses, leaving an estimated 800,000 Pakistanis stranded and cut off from all help;

Whereas according to the Government of Pakistan, the floods have affected 30 percent of all agricultural land and could lower by one-half Pakistan's economic growth rate for the current fiscal year, further destabilizing a nation already beset by multiple daunting challenges;

Whereas the emergency continues to unfold in Sindh Province, where just under 7,000,000 people have already been affected, of whom 1,300,000 are in government relief camps, with new evacuation orders recently having been issued;

Whereas the danger of the floods extends beyond the current humanitarian crisis, with the potential to create significant instability in Pakistan;

Whereas the Pakistani Army, Navy, and Frontier Corps have sent humanitarian supplies and medical teams to flood-hit areas, while the National and Provincial Disaster Management Authorities have coordinated international relief activities;

Whereas the United States has responded to the crisis with relief and recovery funds, food and medical supplies, and logistical support that account for more than 20 percent of total international humanitarian contributions and commitments;

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), through its Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), has supported 26 mobile medical teams, delivered more than 8,000 rolls of plastic sheeting to provide temporary shelter for approximately 247,000 people, and dispatched 13 mobile water treatment units to support the Government of Pakistan's flood relief effort, which have produced more than 12,000,000 liters of clean water;

Whereas USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) has provided direct support for the United Nations World Food Program's food ration distributions, helping to reach approximately 3,000,000 Pakistanis with more than 48,000 metric tons of food;

Whereas the United States Department of Defense has dispatched 23 military helicopters and four C-130 aircraft to deliver more than 5,000,000 pounds of relief supplies and has rescued more than 13,000 flood-affected individuals;

Whereas the United States has provided civilian and military in-kind assistance in the form of halal meals, prefabricated steel bridges, and other infrastructure support;

Whereas the United States is working in close partnership with United Nations-affiliated and international humanitarian organizations to support relief, recovery, and reconstruction;

Whereas the Pakistani-American community has demonstrated strong leadership in rallying support for flood victims, directing public attention to the crisis, and disseminating information about the response;

Whereas scores of United States private and voluntary organizations have mobilized quickly to respond to the crisis in Pakistan with both emergency relief and longer term development assistance, raising over \$11,000,000 in private donations for assessing emergency needs, distributing water, food, and relief items, and providing medical care and temporary shelter;

Whereas the success of United States Government humanitarian efforts depends heavily on the skills, expertise, and field presence of international and nongovernmental organizations;

Whereas United States businesses have contributed more than \$8,000,000 in humanitarian assistance for Pakistani flood victims;

Whereas the immediate and swift reaction of United States military personnel, diplomats, and development experts has saved countless lives and encouraged a generous international response;

Whereas the people of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the United States share a long history of friendship, economic cooperation, and enduring family ties, and the interests of both nations are well served by strengthening and deepening the bilateral relationship;

Whereas the United States Congress adopted, and the President signed into law, the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009, which authorizes democratic, economic, development, and security assistance over 5 years to help the Pakistani people achieve their aspirations for a democratic, stable, and prosperous society; and

Whereas the United States remains committed to helping the resilient and resourceful people of Pakistan surmount and recover from this natural disaster: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) mourns the significant loss of life, as well as the physical damage, caused by the flooding in Pakistan;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences and sympathy to the families of the victims of the floods, and its solidarity with the millions of affected Pakistanis;

(3) recognizes that Pakistan is and remains a close ally and friend of the United States;

(4) recognizes that an effective and accountable government in Pakistan is essential for the country's long-term recovery and stability;

(5) urges the United States Administration and the international community, including private citizens and foreign governments, to continue providing assistance to help the people of Pakistan and to help strengthen and support the capacity of the Government of Pakistan to meet the needs of its people;

(6) supports the use of funds authorized by the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 for the purposes of providing long-term recovery and rehabilitation for flood-affected areas and populations;

(7) urges a reexamination of priorities for spending the funds authorized by the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009, with a view toward ensuring that the needs of the Pakistani people are appropriately addressed in the aftermath of the disaster;

(8) commends the relief and recovery actions, still underway, by the United States military, the Department of State, and USAID to assist the people of Pakistan during this critical period;

(9) commends the extraordinary humanitarian efforts and sustained commitment to helping the people of Pakistan by international and nongovernmental organizations;

(10) recognizes the contributions of the Pakistani-American community and United States businesses to relief and recovery efforts in Pakistan; and

(11) reaffirms the commitment of the people of the United States to partner with the people of Pakistan to respond to the immediate crisis and build the foundations for a successful and lasting recovery.

□ 1240

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) and the gen-

tleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARROW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARROW. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On July 22, 2010, Pakistan began to experience devastating flooding, which in the subsequent days and weeks has led to a severe humanitarian crisis. Thus far, over 20 million Pakistanis have been affected. The flooding has resulted in the deaths of over 1,750 people, injured another 2,700, and left 800,000 cut off from assistance. The floods have submerged one-fifth of the country and damaged or destroyed more than 1.8 million homes, along with countless schools, farms, and businesses.

The Government of Pakistan says that the flooding has affected 30 percent of all agricultural land and could reduce by up to one-half Pakistan's economic growth rate for the current fiscal year, further destabilizing a nation already beset by daunting economic challenges.

The United States has responded to the crisis with over \$250 million in relief and recovery funds, more than 20 percent of the total international humanitarian contribution, in the form of relief and recovery funds, food and medical supplies, and logistical support. Governments and humanitarian aid agencies from around the world have mobilized to provide much needed assistance to the relief and recovery efforts. We hope that all of the committed friends of Pakistan are able to galvanize additional support and funding for the recovery and subsequent reconstruction efforts.

In addition to recognizing the devastating impact of the floods, this resolution emphasizes the importance of a robust and long-term strategic partnership between the United States and Pakistan, the enduring people-to-people and governmental ties between our two countries, and our long-standing support for a democratic, stable, and prosperous Pakistan.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this timely resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the raging floodwaters that have battered much of Pakistan since late July are at long

last finally beginning to recede. But the challenges are no less today than they were earlier this summer. Indeed, if anything, they may be even greater as Pakistan and its friends abroad begin to assess the full magnitude of the economic and human costs of this devastating calamity. The heavy monsoon floods that struck the Indus River and its tributaries have caused enormous damage to the economy and the people of Pakistan.

The numbers are staggering. Nearly 20 million people have been affected by the floods, including millions of men, women, and children who have been physically displaced from their homes destroyed by the ravages of the ram-paging waters. As one Pakistani commentator has noted, "In the mounting humanitarian disaster, survivors have been engaged in a desperate daily struggle for food and shelter as well as a battle against deadly disease."

Pakistan's already shaky economy has been dealt a body blow. Growth is now expected to fall by half, with widespread losses to agriculture and livestock. Meanwhile, the floods have also wreaked havoc on Pakistan's public infrastructure, with bridges and roads cut off, power stations shut down, and gas and petroleum supplies suspended. In this dire circumstance, the United States has responded generously and with great dispatch to assist the people of Pakistan in their hour of need. The executive branch has mobilized expertise and resources at the Departments of State, Defense, and USAID, while the private sector, including Pakistani-Americans, religious communities, and nongovernment organizations have provided impressive financial and on-the-ground assistance.

Meanwhile, new and formidable challenges will present themselves to Islamabad and its friends abroad once the full extent of Pakistan's rehabilitation and reconstruction needs become known.

Madam Speaker, the enormity of this tragedy for the Pakistani people is grounds enough to merit a robust and compassionate response by the United States of America and the people. Our hearts go out to the millions of victims whose lives have been literally uprooted by the havoc that accompanied this unprecedented flooding.

At the same time, we need to be mindful that Pakistan is also a close friend and ally. It plays a large role in the United States' strategic policy towards Afghanistan and the broader reaches of South and Central Asia. It is a country that remains engaged in a deadly struggle against violent extremists seeking to destabilize its already fractured society. It is a nuclear weapons state in which the maintenance of domestic stability and the success of democratic governance bear directly on our own homeland security. To be sure, this is an enormously complex relationship.

Madam Speaker, in this context it is clear that the United States needs to

remain deeply engaged with Pakistan and the Pakistani people as they recover from the ravages of this crisis, including through continued humanitarian aid and related forms of effective, transparent, and targeted assistance. I therefore support the passage of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to get behind this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARROW. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), and I ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and let me thank him very much for his very important statement on this important resolution. And as well I would like to thank the chairman of our full committee, Mr. BERMAN, and the ranking member of our full committee, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and the manager of this legislation for the minority for the words that I believe are enormously important.

Let me indicate to my colleagues that this may be the most important, or one of the most important, and devastating humanitarian crises that we have faced over the time frame that we have been in Congress. And let me say this. We have gone through Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. As I stand here today, there are a number of hurricanes that are in the gulf region. We add our sympathy to the people in California experiencing an enormous and terrible explosion. To my friend from Utah, he knows that those dear friends have experienced their own share of concerns certainly with natural disasters. So we don't take anything away from the suffering of the American people or others. Many of us remember the tsunami, for all of our communities were engaged in trying to get our hands around that natural disaster and to be of help.

But as many have expressed as they have come back to the United States from Pakistan, Madam Speaker, I can assure you that this looms so large that it is without description. The reason is because we know that there was rain, we know that there was a flood, or flooding, but we probably are not aware that the water has remained in place in so much and so many areas of Pakistan that it equals the size of States like Rhode Island. So we have people who cannot return even to see what remains or what losses they have experienced, or to even begin to recover and to rebuild.

I would encourage my colleagues to see the extent of that damage by way of a presentation that is being made today, the Pakistan Flood Disaster Photo Exhibit, from which I will just share one picture. And you can go to

the Rayburn Foyer all day today and see the depth of the devastation.

So I want to thank you, Madam Speaker, as I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1613, expressing condolences to, and solidarity with, the people of Pakistan in the aftermath of the devastating floods that began on July 22, 2010. I would like to thank my colleague, Chairman BERMAN, for introducing this important and timely resolution, which I offer and know that many have cosponsored, including myself.

On July 22, Pakistan experienced one of the heaviest monsoon rains in at least 80 years in the region. For those who have been to Islamabad, Karachi, Lahore, Peshawar, we understand the terrain of that Nation and realize that it is again unspeakable in its description. The massive amount of rain triggered both flash floods and river flooding throughout Pakistan, leading to widespread displacement, infrastructure damage, and contamination of water sources.

Madam Speaker, I have spoken about the value of clean water for many years as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but as well in general in this Congress. And I will tell you that as Pakistani Americans have come to my office, they have said the most deadly aspect of this flood is for mothers and babies and children and families not to be able to have clean water. And therefore disease being spread through lack of clean water, seeing malnourished children, but children who are likewise devastated by not having water suffering from infection and disease.

The flooding has caused a humanitarian crisis of unprecedented proportions that has affected over 20 million people, which aid agencies assert has a greater human impact than Pakistan's earthquake in 2005, the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004, and the recent earthquake in Haiti combined.

□ 1250

More than 1,750 people have been killed; 2,700 have been injured; and millions of men and women and children are displaced. Let me be very clear: we do not do one-upsmanship in disasters. We do not diminish Haiti; we do not diminish the tsunami or the earthquake. What we are saying is that the disaster we speak of today is ongoing, as there are in other places around the world, but ongoing to the extent that people who want to help, to come in and help and be part of recovery, cannot get to where they need to be.

Moreover, flooding is expected to intensify as rains continue. In the Sindh and Punjab provinces, for example, earlier rainfall in the north has led to rising levels in the Indus River and is expected to coincide with increased rainfall.

The flood disaster, which started 2 months ago as a result of heavy monsoon rain, has left more than 20 million people suffering in the ravaged condi-

tions. One-fifth of Pakistan is submerged in water, destroying critical infrastructure, schools, homes, hospitals, business and farms.

My heartfelt condolences go out to the families in Pakistan and those individuals here in the United States who have loved ones in the affected areas. I am urging our government to offer resources and expertise, including assistance and recovery efforts, to help our friends in Pakistan make it through this tragic episode.

We are now discussing how we provide new technology to decontaminate the water, and I hope that the State Department will receive the information that my office has to work on this new technology and literally carry it over to be able to decontaminate this water and to provide clean water to the refugee camps but also to those who may have been able to make it close to where their home was.

I have been working with the State Department to increase humanitarian relief funds for Pakistan and have asked for additional funds that have already been authorized for Pakistan to be reprogrammed in order to bolster relief and reconstruction efforts.

I again want to mention the Foreign Affairs Committee. I want to again mention our chairman and ranking member who have never stepped away from the international devastation that so many of our friends experience. The Foreign Affairs Committee has stood front and center to work with the Senate and work with the administration to ensure that the faith and the friendship of the United States is front and center on these terrible disasters. I thank the committee again.

I also wrote a letter to President Obama with Representative DAN BURTON, my fellow cochair of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus, expressing our deep concern for the humanitarian tragedy in Pakistan and asking them to expedite the flow of U.S. aid, supplies and workers in the region.

I would like to take this opportunity to encourage the President to aid Pakistan and to add Pakistan to his trip to South Asia, which is planned for the fall, and hope that we could join with him.

Madam Speaker, the key is how do we find solutions, and I would ask that we as Americans not be defined, as small news postscripts suggest, that we are not contributing to the aid of the Pakistani people. First of all, we are moving emergency dollars, but I also hope that we can draw upon Americans' individual caring and humanitarian commitment so that we can send a mercy plane stocked with medicine and baby formula and clothing for children and school supplies in short order to this devastated region.

In Houston, a number of my constituents met as a part of the Pakistan Caucus to commit themselves to this great humanitarian effort, and we would call upon all who can hear my voice to participate in helping us pursue that. This

resolution is a very important statement that says to the American people and to our colleagues that we are supporting the people of Pakistan who need our help.

I do again want to acknowledge the partnership of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus and the Pakistani American Leadership Center that is bringing these Pakistan relief workers here to discuss the devastating conditions in Pakistan.

I also want to mention Ambassador Anne Patterson, who is still in Pakistan, who has been a stalwart of representation of the United States, who has been through the earthquake, who has been through the tragedy of the loss of Benazir Bhutto and now this unspeakable tragedy of flooding and has maintained the leadership of the United States.

I am very glad that we have this resolution on the floor of the House. I want to thank my friend and colleague who likewise has given a very important statement, as well as the gentleman from Georgia, to acknowledge this resolution to express our commitment to the people of Pakistan.

I look forward to visiting Pakistan to see firsthand the extent of the devastation and to assess and assist in the relief efforts. With the need for reconstruction and recovery efforts growing, I believe it is vital that we lead a congressional humanitarian mission to Pakistan, which will signal to those people that the friendship between the United States and Pakistan remains unbroken as we fight the war on terror and continue to hope to improve the lives of the men, women and children of this great nation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1613, "Expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Pakistan in the aftermath of the devastating floods that began on July 22, 2010." I would like to thank my colleague, Chairman BERMAN, for introducing this important and timely resolution.

On July 22, 2010, Pakistan experienced one of the heaviest monsoon rains in at least 80 years in the region. The massive amount of rain triggered both flash floods and river flooding throughout Pakistan, leading to widespread displacement, infrastructure damage and contamination of water sources. The flooding has caused a humanitarian crisis of unprecedented proportions that has affected over 20 million people, which aid agencies assert is a greater human impact than Pakistan's earthquake in 2005, the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004, and the recent earthquake in Haiti combined. More than 1,750 people have been killed, 2,700 have been injured, and millions of men, women, and children are displaced. Moreover, the flooding is expected to intensify as rains continue. In Sindh and Punjab provinces, for example, earlier rainfall in the north has led to rising water levels in the Indus River and is expected to coincide with increased rainfall.

The flood disaster, which started two months ago as a result of heavy monsoon rain, has left more than 20 million people suffering in ravaged conditions. One fifth of Paki-

stan is submerged in water, destroying critical infrastructure, schools, homes, hospitals, businesses, and farms. My heartfelt condolences go out to the families in Pakistan and those individuals here in the United States who have loved ones in the affected areas. I am urging our government to offer any resources and expertise, including assistance with recovery efforts, to help our friends in Pakistan make it through this tragic episode. I have been working with the State Department to increase humanitarian relief funds for Pakistan and have asked for additional funds that have already been authorized for Pakistan to be reprogrammed in order to bolster relief and reconstruction efforts. I also wrote a letter to President Obama with Rep. DAN BURTON, my fellow Co-Chair of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus, expressing our deep concern for the humanitarian tragedy in Pakistan and asking him to expedite the flow of U.S. aid, supplies, and workers into the region.

I would also like to take this opportunity to encourage President Obama to add Pakistan to his trip to South Asia, which is planned for this fall. In light of the recent devastation affecting Pakistan and our important alliance with Pakistan in our anti-terrorism efforts in both Pakistan and Afghanistan, I think President Obama's visit would communicate to both the people and government of Pakistan the extent of our national commitment to their welfare.

Madam Speaker, the scale of the devastation is so large that it will take months before we know the actual death toll and be able to assess the damage of the flood. Hospitals are overwhelmed with the injured and thousands of people are stuck on their rooftops and in higher areas as they try to escape rushing floodwaters. Thousands of victims require additional shelter with the cold weather approaching; falling temperatures, food shortages, and water-borne diseases are making it necessary for Pakistan to shelter, cloth, and feed the millions of displaced and homeless before freezing temperatures arrive.

As Co-Chair of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus, I am extremely concerned with the security of the region. It is critical that the United States offer the economic and humanitarian assistance necessary for Pakistan in its recovery efforts. In a region of political and religious turmoil, the United States must do all it can in order for Pakistan's fragile democracy to survive and thrive.

Furthermore, as Co-Chair of the Pakistani Caucus, I have taken the initiative to work with several Pakistani organizations and members of the Pakistan community in Houston and throughout the United States to increase awareness and coordinate relief efforts in Pakistan. I have organized meetings and briefings in both Houston and Washington, D.C. as well. This includes a photo exhibit that is occurring in the Rayburn House Office Building foyer today that is being hosted by the Congressional Pakistan Caucus and the Pakistani American Leadership Center (PAL-C) illustrating the extent of the damage caused by the floods in Pakistan. My commitment to the people of Pakistan is unwavering, and I look forward to visiting Pakistan soon to see firsthand the extent of the devastation and to assess and assist in the relief efforts. With the need for reconstruction and recovery efforts growing, I believe it is vital to lead a Congressional humanitarian mission to Pakistan, which

will signal to the people and the nation of Pakistan the extent of our commitment to addressing the challenges they face in the recovery efforts.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2010.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As co-chairs of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus we remain deeply concerned about the humanitarian tragedy unfolding in Pakistan due to the recent historic floods. We respectfully ask you to do everything possible within your authority to help expedite the flow of U.S. and international aid supplies and workers into the region.

By all accounts, the flooding in Pakistan has now affected more than 20 million people, which aid agencies say is a greater human impact than Pakistan's earthquake in 2005, the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004, and the recent earthquake in Haiti combined. Sadly, despite the commendable generosity of the American people and the international community to date, the situation appears to remain perilous. Reports indicate that waterborne disease is rapidly spreading among tens of thousands of flood victims. In addition, food shortages are becoming a major concern as the market prices of essential foods have skyrocketed after billions of dollars worth of crops were destroyed by the flood waters.

We commend the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for immediately undertaking an aid mission to the region; however, we concur with John Holmes, the UN Undersecretary General for Humanitarian Affairs' opinion that "these unprecedented floods pose unprecedented logistical challenges, and this requires an extraordinary effort by the international community." The United States has an historic opportunity to reshape America's image in Pakistan by taking the lead in aggressively addressing Pakistan's immediate relief needs as well as forging international consensus to address Pakistan's longer-term reconstruction needs. For example, last year Congress authorized \$7.5 billion in civilian aid to Pakistan; of which approximately \$1 billion was set aside for democracy building. While we strongly support efforts to strengthen Pakistan's democratic institutions, relief and rehabilitation of the floods victims is a more pressing need. Reprogramming those funds for humanitarian relief would immediately quadruple U.S. aid funds—hopefully spurring other nations to follow suit—and it would do so at no additional cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

We also respectfully urge you to give all due consideration to using the power of the Presidency's bully pulpit to highlight the plight of Pakistanis to the U.S. media and encourage Americans to consider donating to the relief effort. The American people are extremely generous. Time and time again, whenever they have been asked, the American people have rallied to help people around the world. We are confident that the American people will once again demonstrate their generosity by donating to the Pakistani relief efforts if they are made more aware of the tragedy; and a statement from the White House is certain to garner such media attention. To that end, we respectfully ask you to consider making a public appeal to the American public on behalf of the people of Pakistan.

Mr. President, the global fight against extremists who exploit the religion of Islam is not only a military struggle but a struggle to win the hearts and minds of the Muslim world; particularly the young people. We

know that the U.S. response to the 2005 earthquake in Pakistan led to a short-term positive increase in public opinion of the United States in Pakistan. A significant and long-term commitment by the United States to help Pakistan recover from these devastating floods could have an even more profound affect. If we do not seize this opportunity we significantly increase the chances that Pakistan may fall under the influence of extremist elements; that would be disastrous for our future security. We must address the human tragedy unfolding in Pakistan now before it is too late. So once again, we respectfully ask you to everything possible within your authority to help expedite the flow of U.S. and international aide supplies and workers into the region.

We thank you for giving your personal time and attention to this critically important matter.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Member of Congress.
SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, we support the passage of this resolution. Our hearts and prayers go out to the people of Pakistan who are dealing with untold tragedies and difficult situations. I urge passage of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, seeing that we have no other speakers, let me simply conclude by thanking my distinguished friend from Utah. We worked together on other issues.

If I might take a point of personal privilege, I have never doubted his commitment when we speak of these humanitarian issues, and I want to thank you for that. As well, I want to thank Mr. BARROW for his leadership on the issue and hope that he will join us as we work on these devastating conditions in Pakistan.

I ask my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1613, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ESTABLISHING ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS VETERANS' CURATION PROGRAM

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R.

5282) to provide funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Corps with curation and historic preservation activities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5282

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *The Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies are required to preserve and catalogue artifacts and other items of national historical significance that are uncovered during the course of their work.*

(2) *Uncatalogued artifacts within the care of Federal agencies are stored in hundreds of repositories and museums across the Nation.*

(3) *In October 2009, the Corps of Engineers, Center of Expertise for Curation and Management of Archeological Collections, used \$3,500,000 in temporary funds made available in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5) to begin the Veterans' Curation Program to employ and train Iraq and Afghanistan veterans in archaeological processing.*

(4) *The Veterans' Curation Program employs veterans and members of the Armed Forces in the sorting, cleaning, and cataloguing of artifacts managed by the Corps of Engineers.*

(5) *Employees of the Veterans' Curation Program gain valuable work skills, including computer database management, records management, photographic and scanning techniques, computer software proficiency, vocabulary and writing skills, and interpersonal communication skills, as well as knowledge and training in archaeology and history.*

(6) *Experience in archaeological curation gained through the Veterans' Curation Program is valuable training and experience for the museum, forensics, administrative, records management, and other fields.*

(7) *Veterans' Curation Program participants may assist the Corps of Engineers in developing a more efficient and comprehensive collections management program and also may provide the workforce to meet the records management needs at other agencies and departments, including the Department of Veterans Affairs.*

SEC. 2. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT FOR VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN CURATION AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION.

(a) *TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT.—The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall develop a Veterans' Curation Program to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Secretary in carrying out curation and historic preservation activities.*

(b) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—*

- (1) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2011;
- (2) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2012;
- (3) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;
- (4) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2014; and
- (5) \$9,000,000 for fiscal year 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unani-

mous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 5282.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5282, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) to provide a 5-year authorization for the Corps of Engineers' Veterans' Curation Program.

□ 1300

H.R. 5282 is a worthy piece of legislation. It provides job training to our veterans. It helps to record and protect our Nation's cultural resources, and it assists the Corps in fulfilling its obligations to protect our Nation's cultural and historical legacy.

Thousands upon thousands of artifacts rest uncataloged in hundreds of museums and Federal repositories across the country. These objects represent our past and help describe who we are today. It is, therefore, a cultural imperative that we preserve and understand these pieces. It is also a matter of law and policy that we do so.

The Veterans' Curation Program, located at labs in Georgia, the District of Columbia, and Missouri, provides veterans with a skill set to preserve the many cultural and historical artifacts encountered by the Corps of Engineers.

These employees gain valuable work skills in a host of areas, including computer database management, photographic and scanning techniques, and software proficiency. The development of these skills provides valuable training and experience for future work at museums, forensics labs, records management entities, and at government agencies.

This legislation authorizes the program for 5 years, through fiscal year 2015. It also provides a realistic step increase of authorized funding from \$5 million in 2011 through \$9 million in 2015. This will allow the Corps to incrementally expand the program in a rational and deliberate manner.

The Corps has had success with this program using Recovery Act dollars, so I ask all of the Members to join me in supporting this bill. It will ensure the continuation of a worthwhile program that respects the Nation's cultural heritage at the same time as providing valuable training to the men and women who have valiantly served our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Serving our country in uniform is, frankly, probably the most noble thing that any human being can do, and it is such incredible sacrifice that our

troops do, and their families as well. And they are the ones who allow everything that we take for granted on a daily basis—to live in freedom, to live in democracy. They are the ones who allow us to do that. So today we have the opportunity to help transition our soldiers and our veterans into civilian life much more easily.

H.R. 5282 will help to make opportunities available to the brave men and women who are returning from the fight on the global war on terror. And so this legislation will continue our commitment to our veterans through education and employment opportunities.

As part of the civil works mission, the Corps of Engineers uncovers countless historic artifacts continuously. However, a lot of these historic artifacts which are very important items are, frankly, just uncataloged and just semi-abandoned, and they need curation.

This is such a commonsense bill. It helps preserve our history and preserve our past, while also making sure that we give opportunities to the most noble, to the best and the brightest of our country, to our troops and to our veterans.

I urge all Members to support our veterans and support this real commonsense, noble legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW. I thank the gentlelady for yielding her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, in October of 2009, the Army Corps of Engineers used temporary funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to begin the Veterans' Curation project to employ and train wounded Iraq and Afghanistan veterans in archeological processing. The project gives these veterans an opportunity to learn transferable job skills and earn a fair wage while cataloging artifacts that the Corps has discovered and is required to preserve. The project now employs about 50 veterans in Augusta, Georgia; St. Louis, Missouri; and Washington, D.C.

Unfortunately, temporary funding for the Veterans' Curation project is set to run out just when our returning veterans and our economy need it the most. H.R. 5282 provides long-term authorization for the program and will preserve the program and allow it to grow.

The Veterans' Curation project not only helps educate, train, and employ veterans, but it allows them to heal through the power of meaningful work. Since the Army Corps of Engineers has to catalog these artifacts anyway, there can be no better qualified or more deserving group than our own veterans to help get the job done. We owe no debt as citizens that is greater than the debt we owe to the veterans

who fought for our freedoms. We literally owe them everything.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support this worthy program to help our wounded veterans heal and get good job skills at the same time. It's not only the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I think the issue has been adequately explained. This is something that has to be done. Who better to do it? Who is more qualified and who is more deserving? Who is better to do it than our veterans, than our troops and our soldiers?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5282, as amended, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW). This legislation makes permanent an innovative U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' program begun under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5. Under the Recovery Act, the Corps allocated \$3.5 million to open three Veterans Curation Project, VCP, laboratories throughout the nation. This legislation is important because it provides funding for hiring and training our veterans, while helping the Corps meet its cultural responsibilities. At a time when Americans need jobs more than ever, we should do all we can to increase training and employment, especially for returning veterans.

One of the Army Corps' responsibilities is its role in providing curation support for its projects. Accordingly, the Corps identifies, evaluates, and manages cultural resources that are eligible for listing in, or are listed in, the National Register of Historic Places. The Corps is responsible for ensuring that cultural resource management activities are consistent with Federal laws and regulations pertaining to Native American rights, curation and collections management, and the protection of resources from looting and vandalism.

To that end, the Corps used Recovery Act dollars to open three VCP laboratories in Augusta, Georgia; Washington, DC; and St. Louis, Missouri. These laboratories are tasked with carrying out the Corps' curation responsibilities, including cataloging, scanning, and photographing records and artifacts. At the same time, these laboratories use and train a workforce of disabled, wounded veterans, as well as veterans who have recently returned from overseas.

The VCP program is a very important program for our veterans because it teaches them skills in computer databases, digital scanning, digital image capture, and writing. Veterans who participate in this program can use these technical skills in jobs outside the VCP laboratories, including as forensic technicians and records managers.

This bill provides a statutory, five-year authorization of the Corps' Veterans Curation Project. The bill allows the Corps to meet its dual mission of hiring and training the Nation's veterans, while also carrying out its responsibilities to preserve and protect the Nation's cultural heritage.

We owe our veterans all the training and support we can provide them when they return home from serving our country. I would also like to point out that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure received letters of support for this legislation from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the Society for American Archaeology.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5282.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5282, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW W. BOGUE FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5651) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 515 9th Street in Rapid City, South Dakota, as the "Andrew W. Bogue Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5651

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ANDREW W. BOGUE FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 515 9th Street in Rapid City, South Dakota, shall be known and designated as the "Andrew W. Bogue Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Andrew W. Bogue Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5651.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5651, which designates the federally occupied building located at 515 9th Street in Rapid City, South Dakota, as the "Andrew W. Bogue Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Judge Andrew W. Bogue was a World War II veteran who served in the U.S. Army Signal Corps during the war. After serving with the U.S. Army, Judge Bogue graduated from the University of North Dakota School of Law and went into private practice for several years before another stint in the U.S. Army with the JAG Corps.

Judge Andrew Bogue was nominated to the Federal bench by President Richard Nixon in 1970 and served for 15 years as an active district Federal judge before taking senior status in 1985. Even after taking senior status, Judge Bogue continued to hear cases up until a few months before his death on June 10, 2009.

□ 1310

Given Judge Andrew Bogue's contribution to public service to his country and the great State of South Dakota, it is fitting to designate the Federal building and the United States Courthouse located at 515 Ninth Street in Rapid City, South Dakota, as the Andrew W. Bogue Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I think the gentlelady from Texas explained this bill very well. Obviously Judge Bogue had a very distinguished career, and I want to highlight the fact that he also served in the U.S. Army Signal Corps during World War II and later in the JAG Corps. I think it is important when somebody does that, when they have done so much, to highlight that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN).

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON for yielding me this time and for her support of the bill. This legislation enjoys bipartisan support of the South Dakota congressional delegation.

Judge Andrew Bogue served this country honorably throughout his lifetime. A native of Parker, South Dakota, he served in the Army Signal Corps during World War II, and later in the Judge Advocate General Corps. He served as a State's attorney for his home Turner County and was elected as a judge in the Second Judicial Circuit Court.

In 1970, both South Dakota Senators at that time, Karl Mundt, a Republican, and George McGovern, a Democrat, recommended that President Nixon appoint Judge Bogue to the U.S. District Court for the State of South Dakota. Judge Bogue served in that po-

sition until his passing just last year. He was trying cases and working hard all of the way up to his 90th birthday.

When Judge Bogue was confirmed, there was no Federal courthouse in Rapid City. As the first judge to be based in the western part of South Dakota, he served his first year in Deadwood. He moved his courtroom to Rapid City and worked the next few years in the First Federal Savings and Loan Building. Judge Bogue was present at the very beginning when the General Services Administration began planning the Federal building and courthouse that we are renaming after him today, and he participated in that planning. Put simply, Judge Bogue is a major reason the Rapid City Courthouse exists as it does today.

Judge Bogue was an impressive figure on the bench, and lawyers who practiced before him knew him as someone who listened and who was committed to justice. Because of his role and his contributions to the administration of justice throughout his career on the bench, the group tasked with renaming the Rapid City Courthouse unanimously agreed on Judge Bogue, and I can think of no better tribute to his legacy.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support H.R. 5651, to name the Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse in Rapid City, South Dakota, after Judge Andrew W. Bogue.

Judge Bogue, appointed by President Nixon in 1970, with a strong recommendation from Senator George McGovern, was the first sitting Federal judge in Rapid City. He had been a distinguished State circuit court judge before his appointment to the Federal bench, and was also a veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict. Judge Bogue also oversaw the construction of the building proposed to be named for him by this legislation.

In light of Judge Bogue's life-long dedication to public service, I find it fitting and appropriate that we designate this building the "Andrew W. Bogue Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5651.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5651.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK EVANS GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5706) to designate the facility of the Government Printing Office located at

31451 East United Avenue in Pueblo, Colorado, as the "Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5706

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building occupied by the Government Printing Office located at 31451 East United Avenue in Pueblo, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the "Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building" during the period in which the building is occupied by the Government Printing Office.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

With respect to the period in which the building referred to in section 1 is occupied by the Government Printing Office, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5706, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5706, as amended, which designates the facility of the Government Printing Office located at 31451 East United Avenue in Pueblo, Colorado, as the Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building.

Congressman Evans is a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, born September 6, 1923, in Pueblo, Colorado. After serving as a U.S. Navy pilot during World War II, Congressman Evans attended the University of Denver, graduating with a bachelor's degree, and then received his law degree in 1950. Congressman Evans went on to be elected to the Colorado State House of Representatives in 1960. After serving in the Colorado House of Representatives, Congressman Evans would go on to win seven terms representing Colorado's Third Congressional District in 1964 before retiring in 1978. He is often credited with helping to bring the Federal Citizen's Information Center to Pueblo, Colorado, in 1970. Unfortunately, Congressman Frank Edwards Evans died this past summer on June 8, 2010.

Given Representative Evans' exceptional service to the Federal Government and to the Third Congressional

District of Colorado, it is fitting to honor him by naming the Government Printing Office located at 31451 East United Avenue in Pueblo, Colorado, as the Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to highlight what the gentlelady from Texas already said. I think it is worth repeating. We know about his career, but I want to highlight the fact that he did serve in the United States Navy as a patrol pilot during World War II. I think that we all need to thank our veterans for their patriotism. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this up. He is someone I have great admiration and respect for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. I want to thank the gentlelady from Texas and also the gentleman from Florida, who are my wonderful friends.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5706, to name the Government Printing Office Public Document Distribution Center in Pueblo, Colorado, after former Congressman Frank Evans. From 1964 until 1978, Congressman Evans represented Colorado's Third Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives. That is the seat I now currently serve.

The tremendous impact of his leadership on our district can still be felt to this day. Congressman Evans was responsible for bringing the Government Printing Office to Pueblo, and I cannot think of a more appropriate way to recognize his hard work and commitment to western Colorado than to name this building in his honor.

From the time Congressman Evans gained congressional approval for the building in 1970, it has employed anywhere from 25 to 176 Colorado workers. This year is the 40th anniversary of Congressman Evans' work to bring this building to Pueblo, and the GPO and its employees are more dedicated to serving the public than ever.

Unfortunately, Congressman Evans passed away in June of this year, and my condolences go out to his family during this difficult time. I was honored to attend his funeral. He will be missed, but his memory lives on through the lives he touched and the legacy he left in western Colorado. In honor of Congressman Evans, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, H.R. 5706, as amended, which designates the building occupied by Government Printing Office in Pueblo, Colorado, as the "Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building".

Frank Evans, who passed away on June 8, 2010, was a seven-term congressman from

the third district of Colorado, serving in the House from 1965 through 1979. He attended Pomona College in Claremont, California, interrupting his education to serve in the United States Navy as a patrol pilot during World War II. He returned to formal schooling to earn both a bachelor of arts and a law degree from the University of Denver. He was a member of the Colorado State House of Representatives from 1961–1964.

Among his achievements while serving in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Evans is credited with bringing the Federal Citizen Information Center to Pueblo in 1970. The information center is operated by the Government Printing Office, GPO, and prints and mails free consumer publications. The GPO has been in continuous occupancy of the building to be named by this bill for 40 years. It is a leased building, but the ownership entity has expressed its full assent to naming the building for Congressman Evans for as long as the GPO occupies the premises.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5706.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5706, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the building occupied by the Government Printing Office located at 31451 East United Avenue in Pueblo, Colorado, as the 'Frank Evans Government Printing Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the Table.

□ 1320

JAMES CHANEY, ANDREW GOODMAN, MICHAEL SCHWERNER, AND ROY K. MOORE FEDERAL BUILDING

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3562) to designate the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner Federal Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. BUILDING DESIGNATION.

The Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, is known and designated as the "James

Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

With respect to the period in which the building referred to in section 1 is federally occupied, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to designate the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the 'James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the Senate amendments to H.R. 3562.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3562, which designates the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building.

The Senate amendment to H.R. 3562 adds FBI agent Roy K. Moore to the naming designation of the federally occupied building that will house the Jackson, Mississippi, FBI field office. Agent Roy Moore was personally picked by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to lead the investigation into the deaths of Civil Rights activists James Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner.

The events surrounding these three young men have a special place in civil rights history. They were civil rights activists who were training in Ohio to organize African Americans in Mississippi during the Freedom Summer of 1964. These three men represented a wave of young Americans who took time off from other parts of their lives to wade into certain adversity and to fight for equal rights for all Americans.

All of the activists were murdered in the Freedom Summer of 1964, and their bodies were buried in an earthen dam outside of Philadelphia, Mississippi. FBI agent Roy Moore was tasked with leading the investigation of their disappearances and of bringing their attackers to justice. The events of that summer were later widely lauded as an

important milestone in bringing law and order to Mississippi with respect to African American civil rights. Agent Moore's efforts resulted in 19 people being indicted in 1967 for violating the civil rights of these three gentlemen. Ultimately, seven men were tried and convicted. Roy Moore served 34 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and died on October 12, 2008, at the age of 94.

It is fitting that we honor the memories of these young men and the memory of the FBI agent responsible for leading the investigation of their disappearances by designating the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are a very young Nation, but it is so crucial that we remember our history and that we honor our martyrs. This is one of those examples when we have a great opportunity to do both.

These individuals gave their lives for the rights that we, frankly, take for granted now and that we hold so dear. Special Agent Moore ensured that the rule of law was enforced and that those murderers were brought to justice, so I think that it is fitting and appropriate to honor these men by naming the FBI building in Jackson, Mississippi, after them. I also support the Senate amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3562, an act to designate the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building.

Madam Speaker, 45 years ago, three young men lost their lives while attempting to organize and register voters during that time known as Freedom Summer. These men were James Chaney, a 21-year-old man from Meridian, Mississippi; Andrew Goodman, a 20-year-old college student from New York; and Michael Schwerner, a 24-year-old CORE organizer and social worker who was also from New York.

On July 21, 1964, the three men were driving from Meridian, Mississippi, to Longdale, Mississippi, to investigate the burning of Mount Zion United Methodist Church, which had been the meeting place for numerous civil rights

groups. Along their journey, the trio was stopped by a Neshoba County deputy who was also a known member of the Ku Klux Klan. Subsequently, the three young men were arrested for speeding and were held without the use of a telephone at the Neshoba County jail. Hours later, they were fined and released.

Shortly after the trio continued their journey, they were again pulled over by the sheriff's deputy, who likely unbeknownst to them, was followed by a mob of Klansmen who had assembled to abduct and kill the men. The three individuals were taken to a remote area of the county and were beaten and killed. Their car was burned, and their bodies were buried in an earthen dam.

Days after their disappearances, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover personally selected Agent Roy K. Moore to lead the investigation effort. Agent Moore had become renowned for his investigation of the 1963 bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, which killed four young girls. As the investigation's lead agent, Moore was charged with commanding hundreds of agents who temporarily flooded the State—many of them reluctant to do their work.

After significant investigation by Agent Moore and the FBI, the three individuals' bodies were found on August 4, 1964. Due to Mississippi's officials' refusal to prosecute the individuals for murder, the Justice Department brought charges against 17 individuals for conspiracy to deprive the three workers of their civil rights. Seven of the 17 individuals were found guilty, but none of them served terms longer than 6 years in jail.

Finally, on June 21, 2005, a Neshoba County jury convicted Edgar Ray Killen on three counts of manslaughter and sentenced him to three consecutive terms of 20 years in prison in connection with the deaths of these young men.

The murder of James Chaney, who was black, and the murders of Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, who were both Jewish, attracted national attention to the reality of the State's racial problems. As a result of their deaths, there was more pressure on the Federal Government to pass the Voting Rights Act.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the House for quickly moving this legislation after it was returned from the Senate.

The struggle for justice and equality has eternally bonded James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore. Today, Congress will act to link their legacy to Mississippi's newest symbol of justice and equality.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3562, which designates the federally occupied building located at 1220 Echelon Parkway in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "James Chaney,

Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and Roy K. Moore Federal Building".

This bill, as originally passed by the House, named this Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, facility in Jackson after James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, civil rights activists who were lynched in the summer of 1964 while attempting to organize African Americans to vote and pursue other civil rights in Mississippi. On June 21, 1964, the three men drove to Longdale, Mississippi, to investigate the site of a burned church in Neshoba County. They were arrested by the Neshoba County police as they were leaving the site and held by the police for several hours. They were later released only to be re-arrested shortly thereafter. After the second arrest, the Neshoba County police officer turned the three civil rights activists over to local Klansmen. On August 4, 1964, 44 days later, their bodies were found buried in an earthen dam near Philadelphia, Mississippi. The Senate amendment to H.R. 3562 adds FBI Agent Roy K. Moore to the building name.

Agent Roy Moore was personally picked by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to lead the investigation into the deaths of these young men. Nineteen men were later indicted; seven were tried and convicted. Agent Moore said the FBI would be there until it broke the back of the Ku Klux Klan, reestablished the rule of law at the local level, and enforced the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Senate amendment to H.R. 3562.

□ 1330

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, again, this is an important piece of legislation, and I would urge its support.

With that, I would yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I support this legislation, move that it pass, and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3562.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ROBERT M. BALL FEDERAL BUILDING

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5773) to designate the Federal building located at 6401 Security Boulevard in Baltimore, Maryland, as the "Robert M. Ball Federal Building," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5773

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 6401 Security Boulevard in Baltimore, Maryland, commonly known as the Social Security Administration Operations Building, shall be known and designated as the "Robert M. Ball Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Robert M. Ball Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5773.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5773, as amended, which designates the Social Security Operations Building located at 6401 Security Boulevard in Baltimore, Maryland, as the Robert M. Ball Federal Building.

Commissioner Ball was often described in press accounts as not only the longest serving Social Security Commissioner, but also as chief advocate and defender through the years. Commissioner Ball started with the Social Security Administration as a field assistant in 1939 in New Jersey for the Social Security Administration, eventually becoming the Social Security Administrator from 1962 to 1973.

After Commissioner Ball left the Social Security Administration, he continued to have an outsized role in shaping the program. In 1981, he served as a member of the National Commission on Social Security Reform, arguing for a mix of tax increases and benefit cuts to maintain the viability of Social Security. Commissioner Ball was an outspoken opponent of any attempts to dismantle Social Security or to privatize Social Security. Commissioner Robert M. Ball died January 29, 2008.

Given Commissioner Ball's exceptional public service and dedication to the Social Security Administration, it is fitting to honor him by naming the Operations Facility of the Social Security Administration located at 6401 Security Boulevard in Baltimore, Mary-

land, as the Robert M. Ball Federal Building. I urge support of my colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Ball served as Commissioner of Social Security during the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon administrations, and even in 1981, he served on the Greenspan Commission that was created by President Reagan to examine the Social Security system. So I think it speaks obviously very well for him; his expertise was tapped by both Republicans and Democratic administrations. It seems fitting, Madam Speaker, that we name a Social Security building after him in recognition for his dedication to that agency.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, normally I don't come to the floor to add to a building naming that's flying through, but I want to put into the RECORD my thoughts about Bob Ball, one of the most remarkable people I have ever met. And there is no one I have met whose public sector contribution I admire more. Naming this building on the campus of Social Security, a building that has so much of the daily delivery of the Social Security benefit to the American people, having this building carry his name is just so utterly appropriate.

Bob Ball, through his entire service, had a clear vision of Social Security. It comes down to simply this: If all of us protected each of us, the lives of tens of millions would be improved and our country would be stronger as a result.

He was the most influential proponent of social insurance our country has ever had. He was a leading thinker, a gifted administrator, a skilled political operative, an irresistible advocate, an exceptional teacher, and I can tell you personally he was a very wise mentor.

Of all of his remarkable abilities and traits, perhaps the one we will remember most was his dogged persistence. He stayed on task and made valuable contributions to Social Security through six decades of service. Bob knew what his mission was and he never wavered in pursuit of it. By the time he resigned as Administrator of Social Security, he had literally worked at the agency for 37 years. He was the longest tenured administrator serving under three different Presidents of two political parties.

Now, when he retired after 37 years, you might think, well, there he goes riding off into the sunset, job well done. Well, Bob indicated another inclination. In fact, he wrote in his letter

of resignation to President Nixon, "I will continue to be available for whatever help I can give promoting the sound development and sound administration of this important program."

As the preceding speaker said already, he served on the committee that ultimately worked the long-term solvency package for Social Security out in 1983, and he continued to work right until his final days—at the ripe age of 93—on advancing this notion of Social Security for the American people.

There is nobody I can think of more deserving of the perpetuating honor memorializing his life and his work than Bob Ball, and I am just delighted with this resolution and urge Members' support.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5773, as amended, which names the operations building on the Social Security Woodlawn campus in Baltimore, Maryland, as the "Robert M. Ball Federal Building", after former Social Security Administrator, Robert M. Ball.

Robert M. Ball dedicated his professional life to Social Security and its beneficiaries, serving as Commissioner of Social Security from 1962 to 1973, spanning the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. During his tenure in a variety of senior executive positions at the Social Security Administration, both the disability program and Medicare were enacted into law, and Commissioner Ball played a significant role in creating, securing enactment of, and implementing both of these landmark pieces of legislation.

Commissioner Ball, after retiring from public service in 1972, remained active and engaged in social security issues and policy. In 1981–83, he served on the Commission on Social Security Reform. Mr. Ball was instrumental in working out a compromise among Commission members, that led to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1983, which restored solvency to the Social Security Trust Fund. These amendments remain the most substantive changes to the social security system in the last 30 years.

Recognizing the contributions of Robert M. Ball to the Social Security system by naming the Operations Building at the Social Security Woodlawn campus is a fitting and apt tribute to this public servant who one historian describes as "the major non-Congressional player in the history of Social Security in the period between 1950 and the present."

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5773.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I introduced H.R. 5773 to name the Social Security Operations Building in Baltimore in honor of Robert "Bob" Ball, a man who dedicated his career to defending and strengthening Social Security and who helped to expand the safety net for our Nation's seniors by supporting the creation of Medicare.

Mr. Ball's legacy of service makes it truly fitting that we designate the Social Security Operations Building located at 6401 Security Boulevard in Baltimore, Maryland, as the "Robert M. Ball Federal Building."

Mr. Ball helped build Social Security from the ground up.

In 1939, he started working for the newly formed Social Security Board as a field assistant in Newark, New Jersey.

His experiences in the field demonstrated to him that Social Security was meant to be a contract between the generations enacted to ensure that retired seniors could avoid poverty in their later years. Mr. Ball's dedication to this basic principle guided all of his future work.

In 1949, Mr. Ball was appointed assistant director of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance. He was subsequently promoted to deputy director and then acting director.

Through these positions, he developed a deep technical expertise in Social Security, learned how Congress works, and developed the relationships with Members of Congress that would enable him to serve as a valued technical resource for decades.

During his tenure, Mr. Ball assisted Congress members in developing the policies that have been essential to ensuring Social Security programs are run responsibly and effectively.

For example, Bob Ball was the architect of the 1950 amendments raising Social Security benefits and expanding coverage to more Americans, including such groups as the self-employed, and making it easier for these groups to begin to qualify for benefits.

Ball helped draft the legislation establishing Social Security disability benefits in 1956 and helped Members secure its passage even though the Eisenhower administration opposed this change.

In 1957, Ball helped Representative Aime Forand draft a bill that was essentially the forerunner of the legislation that created Medicare. Ball continued to advocate for health insurance for seniors from that time until Medicare's eventual passage in 1965.

For this and his subsequent work supporting the implementation of the Medicare program, he is also known as the father of Medicare.

President John F. Kennedy appointed Robert M. Ball as commissioner of Social Security in 1962. Mr. Ball served in this post until 1973—longer than anyone else prior or since.

During his service as commissioner, Mr. Ball helped develop the 1972 amendments that linked benefits to inflation, ensuring that Social Security would never fail to meet basic needs.

Robert M. Ball continued to serve Social Security beneficiaries even after leaving government employment through his service on several federal commissions, including the Greenspan Commission in 1983, where he helped broker a compromise that averted a financial crisis and brought decades of financial stability to the Social Security trust fund.

Robert Ball was described by *American Scholar* magazine in 2005 as Social Security's "biggest thinker, longest-serving commissioner and undisputed spiritual leader" and as "Social Security's chief advocate and defender."

I cannot imagine a better tribute to a man who dedicated his life to the health and welfare of others than that his name be permanently attached to the building where Social Security operates.

As I close, I thank my colleagues from Maryland who have co-sponsored this legislation as well as Chairman OBERSTAR, Ranking Member MICA, and my colleagues in the Transportation and Infrastructure committee for working with me to move this legislation.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I simply ask for support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5773, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the Federal building located at 6401 Security Boulevard in Baltimore, Maryland, commonly known Social Security Administration Operations Building, as the 'Robert M. Ball Federal Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1340

OBSERVING FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF HURRICANE RITA

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1583) observing the fifth anniversary of the date on which Hurricane Rita devastated the coasts of Louisiana and Texas, remembering those lost in the storm and in the process of evacuation, recovery, and rebuilding; saluting the dedication of the volunteers who offered assistance in support of those affected by the storm, recognizing the progress of efforts to rebuild the affected Gulf Coast region, commending the persistence of the people of the States of Louisiana and Texas following the second major hurricane to hit Louisiana that season, and reaffirming Congress' commitment to restore and renew the Gulf Coast region, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1583

Whereas on September 24, 2005, Hurricane Rita made landfall as a Category 3 hurricane just east of the Texas-Louisiana border, between Sabine Pass and Johnson's Bayou, with wind speeds of 120 miles per hour, and further devastated the Gulf Coast;

Whereas Hurricane Rita caused 7 deaths, forced 3,000,000 residents to evacuate their homes, left 1,000,000 people without electricity (according to the National Climatic Data Center), and caused flooding and tornadoes in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama;

Whereas damages from Hurricane Rita are estimated at \$11,300,000,000;

Whereas in 2005, Hurricane Rita was the second hurricane to reach Category 5 status in the Gulf of Mexico, making it only the third time that more than one Category 5 storm had formed in the Atlantic in the same year (according to the National Climatic Data Center);

Whereas the storm surge from Hurricane Rita was as high as 15 feet near the landfall site and according to the United States Geo-

logical Survey traveled as far as 50 miles inland, causing disastrous flooding and massive loss of property;

Whereas tens of thousands of homes and businesses in Louisiana and Texas were destroyed by the flooding; and

Whereas the United States Geological Survey's National Wetlands Center indicates that 217 square miles of Louisiana's coastal lands were transformed to water after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) observes the fifth anniversary of the date on which Hurricane Rita devastated the coasts of Louisiana and Texas;

(2) expresses its support to the survivors of Hurricane Rita and condolences to the families of its victims;

(3) commends the courageous efforts of those who assisted in the response to the storm and the recovery process;

(4) recognizes the contributions of the communities in Louisiana and Texas to the United States; and

(5) reaffirms its commitment to rebuild, renew, and restore the Gulf Coast region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material on H. Res. 1583.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1583, observing the fifth anniversary of Hurricane Rita.

Hurricane Rita made landfall as a category 3 hurricane just east of the Texas and Louisiana border with wind speeds of 120 miles per hour unleashing devastating destruction.

Hurricane Rita directly led to the deaths of at least seven people, left over 1 million people without electricity, and damaged or destroyed hundreds of thousands of homes. In addition to this devastation the storm caused in Texas and Louisiana, it also caused flooding and tornadoes in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Total damages from the storm are estimated to be over \$11 billion.

Hurricane Rita also led to one of the largest evacuations in United States history. Prior to making landfall, Hurricane Rita set a record as the most intense hurricane ever in the Gulf of Mexico. The storm also set a record for the most rapid intensification for any tropical cyclone, as it strengthened from a category 2 hurricane to a category 5 hurricane in less than a day.

All of these factors, coming less than a month after Hurricane Katrina, prompted 3 million residents to evacuate their homes. In many instances,

those who were evacuating from Hurricane Rita were displaced, having evacuated from Hurricane Katrina.

The good news today is the gulf coast is coming back.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1583.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution recognizes the fifth anniversary of the devastation caused by Rita.

Madam Speaker, as a Floridian, I understand the impact that storms like Rita have on individuals and families and on communities. It's so important that we do remember, that we do not forget.

This resolution was introduced by Representative BOUSTANY of Louisiana and is cosponsored by the entire Louisiana delegation. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his work on this resolution and, frankly, on all issues related to Louisiana's recovery from this disaster. He has been a great leader on issues for his State, and this is one more example of that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), the sponsor of this resolution and a leader on these issues.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida for his kind words, and we share the same sentiments with regard to hurricanes, and we've both dealt with them. I appreciate his work as well and his leadership for the State of Florida.

Madam Speaker, September 24 marks the fifth anniversary of Hurricane Rita's landfall in my southwest Louisiana district. This category 3 storm came ashore with wind speeds of more than 120 miles per hour and 115 feet of storm surge, causing an estimated \$11.3 billion in damages, making it the third most expensive natural disaster in U.S. history.

Hurricane Rita caused widespread destruction to our communities, fragile working wetlands, and critical energy infrastructure in Vermilion, Cameron, and Calcasieu Parishes.

On a personal note, I'd like to thank all of my colleagues who traveled to southwest Louisiana in the months after the storm to witness firsthand the devastation and to offer assistance. I also want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Ranking Member MICA, and the committee staff, as well as the entire Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, who all worked with our delegation to help address some of the problems we faced in this storm's aftermath.

In the past 5 years, I've worked hard to ensure that Rita is not the forgotten

storm and to further assist in the region's recovery and building. I'm proud we have initiated the first-ever hurricane protection plan for southwest Louisiana and included provisions in the 2007 WRDA bill to help expedite the Corps of Engineers' work to ensure projects are not delayed.

Rita exposed the critical state of our coastal wetlands and the role they play in supporting the U.S. energy industry. These wetlands serve as a critical buffer against hurricanes and protect industries and cities located further inland. Before the 2005 storms, the projected land loss in Louisiana was 24 square miles per year. After Katrina and Rita, the national wetland center reported 217 square miles of Louisiana coastal lands were transformed to water.

Protecting and strengthening our coasts is not only a Louisiana problem—it's an American problem. Families and businesses rely on the energy we produce in Louisiana and transport throughout the country each day. We were just starting to regain our way of life along the gulf coast, and Louisianans now face new challenges.

The current moratorium on deep-water drilling in the Gulf of Mexico threatens good-paying jobs and our economic livelihood. This moratorium has idled 33 rigs and the workers on these platforms, and it's hampering south Louisiana's recovery. There are also thousands more support workers affected by this, including welders, electricians, mariners, caterers, and engineers, that aren't directly employed by the drilling operator.

The ramifications of the deepwater moratorium and the de facto shallow water moratorium are being felt as layoffs have begun along the gulf coast. The same hardworking citizens who stayed in south Louisiana to rebuild their homes with their own hands after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita are now experiencing economic devastation.

American energy production in the gulf can be done safely, and we need to work together to quickly implement improved safety standards to put gulf coast residents back to work delivering the energy that this Nation relies upon.

Louisianans are resilient, and I'm proud to work with my community as we continue the long recovery process.

Madam Speaker, I want to salute the dedicated first responders, volunteers, and professionals who offered assistance to those affected by the storm and recognize the progress southwest Louisiana has made in 5 years of restoring and rebuilding our coastal communities.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, in the subcommittee that I am ranking member of, I've had the privilege of working with this next gentleman from Louisiana. He is, frankly, almost single-

handedly responsible for releasing billions of dollars that were stuck in the Federal bureaucracy that should have gone, and now are moving because of his efforts, to rebuild parts of Louisiana.

And so at this moment, it is a privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO).

Mr. CAO. First of all, I want to thank my colleague and mentor from Florida for his tremendous support of me in the last 2 years, and I hope to continue working with him in the future.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1583 offered by my good friend and colleague from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

□ 1350

House Resolution 1583 observes the fifth anniversary of the devastation and destruction caused by Hurricane Rita. On September 24, 2005, Hurricane Rita made landfall along the Louisiana and Texas border as a category 3 hurricane. Rita's landfall was less than 1 month after Hurricane Katrina had ravaged multiple areas along the Gulf Coast, including in Louisiana's Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, which I represent.

Following the heroic work of first responders, our Armed Forces, and countless volunteers in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans was unbelievably scheduled to reopen on September 19. Hurricane Rita's approach, however, made that impossible, and instead the city once again was vulnerable. Levees surrounding New Orleans were damaged extensively by Hurricane Katrina, and were far from repaired. Thousands of blue FEMA tarps remained atop roofs throughout the city, offering only provisional or temporary protection.

On Friday, September 23, the day before Rita made landfall, her outer bands began raising water levels around New Orleans, and the patches on the Industrial Canal and the London Avenue Canal were unable to hold back the rising water. Once again, we were faced with the same flooding which had wreaked so much havoc less than a month before.

New Orleans' Gentilly and Ninth Ward neighborhoods, two of the hardest hit by Katrina, were again flooded, and in some locations the waters rose to a depth of 8 feet. For many, this was a worst nightmare situation happening all over again.

Hurricane Rita resulted in the death of seven individuals and forced the evacuation of 3 million Gulf Coast residents. It also cost an estimated \$11.3 billion in damages. Madam Speaker, as the gulf coast continues its recovery from the recent devastating oil spill, I wish to remind us that only a city, State, and a region of great character and determination can rise from devastation to persevere and recover. And that is what we will do.

On this anniversary, I offer my heartfelt sympathy to the families of the

victims of Hurricane Rita, and I offer my deepest thanks to those who assisted in the recovery process. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1583, as a reconfirmation of this body's commitment to rebuild, renew, and restore the gulf coast region not only from Hurricane Rita, but also Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1583, as amended, observing the fifth anniversary of Hurricane Rita. Hurricane Rita made landfall just east of the Texas-Louisiana Boarder as a category three hurricane on September 24, 2005. Hurricane Rita directly caused the deaths of at least seven people, damaged or destroyed hundreds of thousands of homes, and left over one million people without electricity. In addition to the devastation the storm caused in Louisiana and Texas, it also caused flooding and tornadoes in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Before making landfall, Hurricane Rita was the second hurricane in 2005 to become a category 5 hurricane in the Gulf of Mexico. Hurricane Rita broke Hurricane Katrina's record as the most intense hurricane ever in the Gulf of Mexico. The storm also climbed from a category 2 to a category 5 storm in less than 24 hours with the fastest intensification of any tropical cyclone in history.

Coming less than a month after Hurricane Katrina, this storm forced 3,000,000 million residents to evacuate their homes. In many instances, those who were evacuating from Hurricane Rita were already evacuees displaced by Hurricane Katrina. We also witnessed the unfortunate deaths of 23 nursing home residents who perished when the bus evacuating them caught fire.

As I have mentioned previously, since Hurricane Rita and the other storms of the 2005 hurricane season, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has passed legislation and held numerous hearings to improve not only the recovery from these storms, but also our nation's preparation for, response to, recovery from and mitigation of disasters from all hazards. These efforts continue on September 22, 2010, when the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management will hold a hearing entitled: "Five Years after Katrina: Where We Are and What We Have Learned for Future Disasters."

Prior to the 2005 hurricane season, when our nation faced large or unusual disasters, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was quick to adapt and provide solutions to unique problems that would arise, often working with Congress on those solutions.

However, by 2005, things were very different. FEMA was an agency within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and not an independent agency that reported directly to the President and Congress. As I have said previously, FEMA's performance as an agency has suffered since its inclusion in the Department of Homeland Security in 2003.

Even long after the response to the 2005 hurricane season, the agency's placement in DHS had a detrimental effect on the residents of the Gulf Coast. There were delays in decision making, which delayed delivery of critical assistance to citizens. While things appear to be improving with the recovery in the Gulf

Coast, this improvement was far too long in coming. I am still deeply concerned that, even with the new leadership at FEMA, if FEMA remains in DHS it will not be able to respond to future disasters in the manner the nation needs and expects.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1583.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I have no further requests for time, I simply ask for support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1583, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution observing the fifth anniversary of the date on which Hurricane Rita devastated the coasts of Louisiana and Texas, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2039; H.R. 5873; House Resolution 1522; H.R. 5366; and House Resolution 1610, in each case by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on remaining postponed questions will resume later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CONGRESSIONAL MADE IN AMERICA PROMISE ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2039) to clarify the applicability of the Buy American Act to products purchased for the use of the legislative branch, to prohibit the application of any of the exceptions to the requirements of such Act to products bearing a Congressional seal, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 36, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—371

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Latta
Adler (NJ)	Dicks	Lee (NY)
Akin	Dingell	Levin
Alexander	Djou	Lewis (CA)
Altmire	Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Andrews	Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski
Arcuri	Doyle	LoBiondo
Austria	Driebeaus	Loebach
Baca	Duncan	Lofgren, Zoe
Bachmann	Edwards (MD)	Lowe
Bachus	Edwards (TX)	Lucas
Baird	Ehlers	Luetkemeyer
Baldwin	Ellison	Lujan
Barrow	Emerson	Lungren, Daniel
Barton (TX)	Engel	E.
Bean	Etheridge	Lynch
Becerra	Farr	Mack
Berkley	Fattah	Maffei
Berman	Filner	Maloney
Berry	Forbes	Manzullo
Biggert	Fortenberry	Markey (CO)
Bilbray	Foster	Markey (MA)
Bilirakis	Fox	Marshall
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	Matheson
Bishop (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Matsui
Bishop (UT)	Fudge	McCarthy (CA)
Blumenauer	Gallagher	McCarthy (NY)
Bocieri	Garamendi	McCauley
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	McCollum
Bonner	Gerlach	McCotter
Bono Mack	Giffords	McDermott
Boozman	Gingrey (GA)	McGovern
Boren	Gonzalez	McHenry
Boswell	Goodlatte	McIntyre
Boustany	Gordon (TN)	McKeon
Boyd	Granger	McMahon
Brady (PA)	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Braley (IA)	Grayson	Rodgers
Bright	Green, Al	McNerney
Brown (SC)	Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Griffith	Melancon
Brown-Waite,	Guthrie	Mica
Ginny	Gutierrez	Michaud
Buchanan	Hall (NY)	Miller (MI)
Burgess	Hall (TX)	Miller (NC)
Burton (IN)	Halvorson	Miller, Gary
Butterfield	Hare	Miller, George
Buyer	Harman	Minnick
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Mitchell
Camp	Heinrich	Moore (KS)
Cantor	Heller	Moran (KS)
Cao	Herseth Sandlin	Moran (VA)
Capito	Higgins	Murphy (CT)
Capps	Hill	Murphy (NY)
Capuano	Himes	Murphy, Patrick
Cardoza	Hinchey	Murphy, Tim
Carnahan	Hirono	Myrick
Carney	Holden	Nadler (NY)
Carson (IN)	Holt	Napolitano
Cassidy	Honda	Neal (MA)
Castle	Hoyer	Nunes
Castor (FL)	Hunter	Nye
Chaffetz	Inglis	Oberstar
Chandler	Inslee	Obey
Childers	Israel	Olson
Chu	Issa	Olver
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Owens
Clyburn	(TX)	Pallone
Coble	Jenkins	Pascarella
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Paulsen
Cole	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Connolly (VA)	Jones	Perriello
Conyers	Jordan (OH)	Peters
Cooper	Kagen	Peterson
Costa	Kanjorski	Petri
Costello	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kildee	Pitts
Crenshaw	Kilpatrick (MI)	Platts
Critz	Kilroy	Poe (TX)
Crowley	Kind	Pomeroy
Cuellar	King (NY)	Posey
Culberson	Kirk	Price (NC)
Dahlkemper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Quigley
Davis (AL)	Kissell	Radanovich
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Kline (MN)	Rangel
Davis (KY)	Kosmas	Rehberg
Davis (TN)	Kratovich	Reichert
DeFazio	Kucinich	Reyes
DeGette	Lance	Richardson
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Dent	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)
Deutch	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI) Sestak
 Rohrabacher Shea-Porter
 Rooney Sherman
 Ros-Lehtinen Shimkus
 Roskam Shuler
 Ross Shuster
 Rothman (NJ) Simpson
 Roybal-Allard Sires
 Royce Skelton
 Ruppertsberger Slaughter
 Rush Smith (NE)
 Ryan (OH) Smith (NJ)
 Ryan (WI) Smith (TX)
 Salazar Smith (WA)
 Sánchez, Linda Snyder
 T. Space
 Sanchez, Loretta Speier
 Sarbanes Spratt
 Scalise Stark
 Schakowsky Stearns
 Schauer Sullivan
 Schiff Sutton
 Schmidt Tanner
 Schock Taylor
 Schrader Teague
 Schwartz Terry
 Scott (GA) Thompson (CA)
 Scott (VA) Thompson (MS)
 Sensenbrenner Thompson (PA)
 Serrano Tiahrt

NAYS—36

Barrett (SC) Gohmert
 Bartlett Graves (GA)
 Blackburn Harper
 Brady (TX) Hensarling
 Broun (GA) Herger
 Campbell Hoekstra
 Carter Johnson, Sam
 Conaway King (IA)
 Dreier Kingston
 Flake Lamborn
 Fleming Linder
 Franks (AZ) Lummis

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman Grijalva
 Blunt Hastings (FL)
 Boucher Hinojosa
 Clarke Hodes
 Cummings Kennedy
 Delahunt Langevin
 Ellsworth Lee (CA)
 Eshoo Meek (FL)
 Fallin Mollohan

□ 1424

Messrs. FLAKE, CONAWAY, HERGER, PENCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. CARTER, BRADY of Texas, BARTLETT, LINDER, DREIER and HOEKSTRA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, during roll-call vote No. 521 on H.R. 2039, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

CAPTAIN RHETT W. SCHILLER
POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5873) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218 North Milwaukee Street in Waterford, Wisconsin, as the “Captain Rhett W. Schiller Post Office,” on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

YEAS—411

Aderholt Connolly (VA)
 Adler (NJ) Conyers
 Akin Cooper
 Alexander Welch
 Altmire Whitfield
 Andrews Wilson (OH)
 Arcuri Wilson (SC)
 Austria Wittman
 Baca Wolf
 Bachmann Woolsey
 Bachus Wu
 Baird Yarmuth
 Baldwin Young (AK)
 Barrett (SC)
 Barrow
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Boccieri
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bright
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Cao
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Castor (FL)
 Chaffetz
 Chandler
 Childers
 Chu
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cohen
 Cole
 Conaway

McClintock
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Moore (KS)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts

Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman
 Blunt
 Cummings
 Delahunt
 Ellsworth
 Eshoo
 Fallin
 Hastings (FL)
 Hodes
 Kennedy
 Langevin
 Lee (CA)
 Meek (FL)
 Mollohan
 Moore (WI)
 Payne
 Putnam
 Stupak
 Tierney
 Velázquez
 Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1434

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HEREDITARY BREAST AND OVARIAN CANCER WEEK AND NATIONAL PREVIVOR DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1522) expressing support for designation of the last week of September as National Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Week and the last Wednesday of September

as National Previvor Day, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—408

Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Hare
Adler (NJ)	Cohen	Harman
Akin	Cole	Harper
Alexander	Conaway	Hastings (WA)
Altmire	Connolly (VA)	Heinrich
Andrews	Conyers	Heller
Arcuri	Cooper	Hensarling
Austria	Costa	Herger
Baca	Costello	Herseth Sandlin
Bachmann	Courtney	Higgins
Bachus	Crenshaw	Hill
Baird	Critz	Himes
Baldwin	Crowley	Hinchee
Barrett (SC)	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Barrow	Culberson	Hirono
Bartlett	Dahlkemper	Hoekstra
Barton (TX)	Davis (AL)	Holden
Bean	Davis (CA)	Holt
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Honda
Berkley	Davis (KY)	Hoyer
Berman	Davis (TN)	Hunter
Berry	DeFazio	Inglis
Biggert	DeGette	Inslee
Bilbray	DeLauro	Israel
Bilirakis	Dent	Issa
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson Lee
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)
Blackburn	Dicks	Jenkins
Blumenauer	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Bocieri	Djou	Johnson (IL)
Boehner	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bonner	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Bono Mack	Doyle	Jones
Boozman	Dreier	Jordan (OH)
Boren	Driehtaus	Kagen
Boswell	Duncan	Kanjorski
Boucher	Edwards (MD)	Kaptur
Boustany	Edwards (TX)	Kildee
Boyd	Ehlers	Kilpatrick (MI)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Kilroy
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Kind
Braley (IA)	Engel	King (IA)
Bright	Etheridge	King (NY)
Broun (GA)	Farr	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Fattah	Kirk
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brown-Waite,	Flake	Kissell
Ginny	Fleming	Klein (FL)
Buchanan	Forbes	Kline (MN)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Kosmas
Burton (IN)	Foster	Kratovil
Butterfield	Fox	Kucinich
Buyer	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Camp	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Campbell	Gallely	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Garamendi	Latham
Cao	Garrett (NJ)	LaTourrette
Capito	Gerlach	Latta
Capps	Giffords	Lee (NY)
Capuano	Gingrey (GA)	Levin
Cardoza	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Carney	Goodlatte	Linder
Carson (IN)	Gordon (TN)	Lipinski
Carter	Granger	LoBiondo
Cassidy	Graves (GA)	Loebsack
Castle	Graves (MO)	Lofgren, Zoe
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Lowe
Chaffetz	Green, Al	Lucas
Chandler	Green, Gene	Luetkemeyer
Childers	Griffith	Lujan
Chu	Grijalva	Lummis
Clarke	Guthrie	Lungren, Daniel
Clay	Gutierrez	E.
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Lynch
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Mack
Coble	Halvorson	Maffei

Maloney	Pence	Shadegg
Manzullo	Perlmutter	Shea-Porter
Marchant	Perriello	Sherman
Markey (CO)	Peters	Shimkus
Markey (MA)	Peterson	Shuler
Marshall	Petri	Shuster
Matheson	Pingree (ME)	Simpson
Matsui	Pitts	Sires
McCarthy (CA)	Platts	Skelton
McCarthy (NY)	Poe (TX)	Slaughter
McCaul	Polis (CO)	Smith (NE)
McClintock	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)
McCollum	Posey	Smith (WA)
McCotter	Price (GA)	Snyder
McDermott	Price (NC)	Speier
McGovern	Quigley	Spratt
McHenry	Radanovich	Stark
McIntyre	Rahall	Stearns
McKeon	Rangel	Sullivan
McMahon	Rehberg	Sutton
McMorris	Reichert	Tanner
Rodgers	Reyes	Taylor
McNerney	Richardson	Teague
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Terry
Melancon	Roe (TN)	Thompson (CA)
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Miller (NC)	Rooney	Tiberi
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Miller, George	Roskam	Tonko
Minnick	Ross	Towns
Mitchell	Rothman (NJ)	Tsongas
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Moran (KS)	Royce	Upton
Moran (VA)	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Murphy (CT)	Rush	Visclosky
Murphy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Walden
Murphy, Patrick	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Murphy, Tim	Salazar	Wamp
Myrick	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Nadler (NY)	T.	Schultz
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Neal (MA)	Sarbanes	Watson
Neugebauer	Scalise	Watt
Nunes	Schakowsky	Waxman
Nye	Schauer	Weiner
Oberstar	Schiff	Welch
Obey	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Olson	Schrock	Whitfield
Oliver	Schrader	Wilson (OH)
Ortiz	Schwartz	Wilson (SC)
Owens	Scott (GA)	Wittman
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Wolf
Pascarella	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Wu
Paul	Sessions	Yarmuth
Paulsen	Sestak	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blunt	Hodes	Putnam
Cummings	Kennedy	Smith (NJ)
Delahunt	Langvin	Space
Eshworth	Lee (CA)	Stupak
Kirk	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Mollohan	Molloy	Velázquez
Moore (WI)		Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1441

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERSEAS CONTRACTOR REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5366) to require the proposal for debarment from contracting with the Federal Government of persons violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices

Act of 1977, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—409

Aderholt	Cole	Hastings (WA)
Adler (NJ)	Conaway	Heinrich
Akin	Connolly (VA)	Heller
Alexander	Conyers	Hensarling
Altmire	Cooper	Herger
Andrews	Costa	Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri	Costello	Higgins
Austria	Courtney	Hill
Baca	Crenshaw	Himes
Bachmann	Critz	Hinchee
Bachus	Crowley	Hirono
Baird	Cuellar	Hoekstra
Baldwin	Culberson	Holden
Barrett (SC)	Dahlkemper	Holt
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Honda
Bartlett	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Bean	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Becerra	Davis (TN)	Inslee
Berkley	DeFazio	Israel
Berman	DeGette	Issa
Berry	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Biggert	Dent	Jackson Lee
Bilbray	Deutch	(TX)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Blackburn	Djou	Johnson, Sam
Blumenauer	Doggett	Jones
Bocieri	Donnelly (IN)	Jordan (OH)
Boehner	Doyle	Kagen
Bonner	Dreier	Kanjorski
Bono Mack	Driehtaus	Kaptur
Boozman	Duncan	Kildee
Boren	Edwards (MD)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boswell	Edwards (TX)	Kilroy
Boucher	Ehlers	Kind
Boustany	Ellison	King (IA)
Boyd	Emerson	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Etheridge	Kirk
Braley (IA)	Farr	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Bright	Fattah	Kissell
Broun (GA)	Filner	Klein (FL)
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kline (MN)
Brown, Corrine	Fleming	Kosmas
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Kratovil
Ginny	Fortenberry	Kucinich
Buchanan	Foster	Lamborn
Burgess	Fox	Lance
Burton (IN)	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Calvert	Fudge	LaTourrette
Camp	Gallely	Latta
Campbell	Garamendi	Lee (NY)
Cantor	Garrett (NJ)	Levin
Cao	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Capito	Giffords	Lewis (GA)
Capps	Gingrey (GA)	Linder
Capuano	Gohmert	Lipinski
Cardoza	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Carnahan	Goodlatte	Loebsack
Carney	Gordon (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe
Carson (IN)	Granger	Lowe
Carter	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Cassidy	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Castle	Grayson	Lujan
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Lummis
Chaffetz	Green, Gene	Lungren, Daniel
Chandler	Griffith	E.
Childers	Grijalva	Lynch
Chu	Guthrie	Mack
Clarke	Gutierrez	Maffei
Clay	Hall (NY)	Maloney
Cleaver	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Clyburn	Halvorson	Marchant
Coble	Hare	Markey (CO)
Coffman (CO)	Harman	Markey (MA)
Cohen	Harper	Marshall

Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaull
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson

Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus

Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman
Blunt
Cummings
Delahunt
Ellsworth
Eshoo
Fallin
Hastings (FL)

Hinojosa
Hodes
Kennedy
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Meek (FL)
Mollohan
Moore (WI)

Payne
Putnam
Smith (NJ)
Stupak
Tierney
Velázquez
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1449

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

COMMEMORATING SEPTEMBER 11

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1610) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the terrorist attacks launched against the United States on September 11, 2001, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—410

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney

Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djoudj
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry

Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Henger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen

Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaull
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Pence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman
Blunt
Cummings
Delahunt
Ellsworth
Eshoo
Fallin
Hastings (FL)

Hodes
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Meek (FL)
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Payne
Putnam

Ruppersberger
Smith (NJ)
Stupak
Tierney
Velázquez
Wu
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1459

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1603

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEINRICH) at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SUPPORTING BACKCOUNTRY AIRSTRIPS AND RECREATIONAL AVIATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1473) supporting backcountry airstrips and recreational aviation, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1473

Whereas recreational aviation represents a significant portion of the Nation's aviation activity;

Whereas recreational aviators utilize backcountry airstrips as access points for a variety of activities;

Whereas backcountry airstrips provide multiple benefits to the general public, including search and rescue, fire management, research, disaster relief, and wildlife management benefits;

Whereas recreational aviation helps State economies by providing efficient access to recreational activities for visitors;

Whereas backcountry airstrips serve as emergency landing sites for aircraft in the event of mechanical problems or inclement weather; and

Whereas backcountry airstrips provide for dispersed recreational activity and act as internal trailheads within backcountry areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the value of recreational aviation and backcountry airstrips located on the Nation's public lands and commends aviators and the various private organizations that maintain these airstrips for public use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1473.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1473, as amended, introduced by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG), which expresses support for backcountry airstrips and recreational aviation.

A backcountry airstrip is an unattended landing area in a location that provides access to remote, undeveloped rural areas by aircraft, usually airplanes. Backcountry airstrips provide benefits to the general public, including performing research and rescue operations, fire management, research and aerial mapping, and disaster relief. These airstrips allow tourists to access remote Federal lands that, in turn, helps to support local economies and small businesses. Also, in the event of mechanical problems or inclement weather, backcountry airstrips serve as emergency landing sites when airports are out of reach.

H. Res. 1473 recognizes the value of recreational aviation and backcountry airstrips located on our Nation's public lands. In addition, it commends aviators and the various private organizations that maintain these airstrips for public use. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution currently before us, our colleague from the State of Montana, Representative DENNIS REHBERG.

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Mr. PETRI.

Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my support for House Resolution 1473, supporting recreational aviation and backcountry airstrips on America's public lands.

This resolution is the fruit of a bipartisan effort. I could not have drafted this legislation without the support of my colleagues from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MINNICK, and the co-chairs of the House General Aviation Caucus, Mr. EHLERS and Mr. BOYD.

One hundred years ago, this resolution might have been about supporting horses. Aviation has become as important to the modern West as horses were to the early explorers, trappers and prospectors. That is because the vast majority of Montana's 147,000 square miles aren't easily reached by roads—we've got a lot of dirt between light

bulbs. And like the horse opened new lands in 1910, aviation is critical to access today. That is why backcountry airstrips are such an important part of our way of life.

There are too many benefits to list them all. They enable search and rescue, fire management, research, disaster relief and wildlife management. In the event of mechanical problems or inclement weather, they serve as emergency landing sites when larger airports are out of reach. They allow public access to some of the most beautiful, remote Federal lands in America, regardless of one's physical ability, and they serve as efficient access points for tourists, who in turn contribute to local economies and small businesses. That means jobs. Too often, however, these airstrips are targeted for closure by the Federal Government or well-funded special interest groups, or simply ignored by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Please join the bipartisan support for this measure and vote for House Resolution 1473.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support the resolution before us, H. Res. 1473, recognizing the value of recreational aviation in backcountry airstrips.

Aviation provides access, as we've heard, to the most remote and scenic areas of our national landscape, and not just for recreational users. Backcountry airstrips also provide access for those who do not have the physical ability to get to these areas any other way. The airstrips also serve an important safety function as emergency landing sites in the event of severe weather or another emergency. Sustaining these airstrips is critical to preserving safe flight and access to the American wilderness. It is important to promote and maintain the public use of backcountry airstrips for future generations. Additionally, we should be proud of the individuals and private organizations that donate their time and resources in order to sustain these airstrips for public use and benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and urge its passage by the House today.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1473, as amended, introduced by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG), which expresses support for backcountry airstrips. Generally speaking, a backcountry airstrip is an unattended landing area in a location that provides access to remote, undeveloped rural areas by aircraft, usually airplanes.

Backcountry airstrips are a part of life for many Americans, especially in the West. They provide countless benefits to the general public, including search and rescue, fire management, research, disaster relief and wildlife management. They also allow public access to some of the most beautiful, remote federal lands in America, as well as providing a means of access to remote areas for physically disadvantaged individuals who might not otherwise be able to get to remote locations for leisure.

Backcountry airstrips serve as efficient access points for tourists, who in turn contribute to local economies and small businesses. More importantly, in the event of mechanical problems or inclement weather, they serve as emergency landing sites when larger airports are out of reach.

Many backcountry airstrips are privately owned. In addition, several state aviation offices own and operate backcountry airstrips, and many airstrips are owned by public agencies involved in land management, such as the Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

H. Res. 1473 recognizes the value of recreational aviation and backcountry airstrips located on the nation's public lands and commends aviators and the various organizations that maintain these airstrips for public use.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H. Res. 1473, a resolution supporting recreational aviation and backcountry airstrips on America's public lands.

Backcountry airstrips are a part of life for many Americans, especially in the West. They provide countless benefits to the general public, including search and rescue, fire management, research, disaster relief and wildlife management. They also allow public access to some of the most beautiful, remote federal lands in America regardless of one's physical ability to otherwise enjoy the backcountry.

Backcountry airstrips serve as efficient access points for tourists, who in turn contribute to local economies and small businesses. More importantly, in the event of mechanical problems or inclement weather, they serve as emergency landing sites when larger airports are out of reach. Too often, however, these airstrips are targeted for closure by the federal government or well-funded special interest groups, or simply ignored by bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

During a time when our lands are under threat from drought, insect infestation and wildfire, and when our economy continues to struggle, backcountry airstrips serve a valuable role for land managers and visitors alike. Please join me in recognizing the value of recreational aviation and backcountry airstrips, in addition to commending aviators and the various private organizations that maintain these airstrips for public use.

□ 1610

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons articulated, I again encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1473, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF 19TH AMENDMENT

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1375) recognizing the 90th anniversary of the 19th Amendment, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1375

Whereas full participatory rights by women are vital to democracy in the United States;

Whereas the right to vote of all women in the United States was not guaranteed for 144 years after the Declaration of Independence was signed;

Whereas the Women's Rights Convention was held in Seneca Falls, New York, in July 1848, sparking a decades-long struggle by women's rights pioneers to gain the right to vote;

Whereas a constitutional amendment granting women's suffrage nationwide was first introduced in the United States Congress in January 1878;

Whereas in 1919, the 66th Congress of the United States passed a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women;

Whereas the aforesaid amendment was then ratified by the Legislatures of the States of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Texas, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Montana, Nebraska, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Utah, California, Maine, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, Kentucky, Rhode Island, Oregon, Indiana, Wyoming, Nevada, New Jersey, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, West Virginia, Washington, and Tennessee; and

Whereas, on August 18, 1920, the Tennessee General Assembly voted for ratification by a one-vote margin, passing the amendment in Nashville, Tennessee, becoming the 36th and final of the three-fourths of States needed to ratify the aforesaid amendment, entering it into the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 90th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution;

(2) honors the contributions and achievements of women in United States politics; and

(3) reaffirms its commitment to pursuing policies that achieve true political and social equality for women, commensurate with their role in life in the United States and society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 1375, introduced by the Honorable JIM COOPER of Tennessee, recognizes the 90th anniversary of the 19th Amendment. The 19th Amendment, of course, is the Amendment that gave women the right to vote in this United States, and it was not until 1920 that women got that right to vote.

We didn't start off as a perfect Union. It's taken a lot of time, and we're still working toward becoming that perfect Union.

The 19th Amendment was ratified with the perfect 36th State, which happened to be Tennessee, the last State that could make it by three-quarters of the States needed. There were 48 at the time. Thirty-five had done it. The rest had said they wouldn't. Tennessee was on the spot, and it became the perfect 36th and gave women the right to vote.

It was an historic vote that took place in the Tennessee State capitol. Probably the most historic vote that's ever occurred in that capitol. One of which, a bas-relief on the wall, which I worked on getting placed there, commemorates that event when that vote took place.

One of my relatives, Mr. Joe Hanover, managed the bill in the House. And the Senate, of which I was a member, and Lady BLACKBURN, the Congresswoman on the other side, was also a member of that esteemed body, the State Senate in Tennessee voted with overwhelming numbers to approve the resolution. It was in the House where sometimes they have problems—unlike what we experience here in Washington—where they had difficulty getting the votes together.

And it was about an even vote until the last minute. And a Republican from upper east Tennessee named Harry Burn got a missive from his mother that said, "Harry, do the right thing." And Harry did the right thing, and he cast that vote and it passed by one vote. So women have the right to vote because of the perfect 36th, the State of Tennessee in 1920, August of that year. And it was by one vote.

So it's an important story not only of how far this country has come, because our Constitution, as great as it was, didn't give women the right to vote. It permitted slavery, didn't give women the right to vote, and a lot of other problems. And it took a lot of efforts and civil rights and women's rights and human rights and all to bring us to where we're getting today. We still have a ways to go. But it also says how important one vote is, because one vote made that difference.

Prior to the ratification of the 19th Amendment, only a handful of States allowed women to vote at all, and that was in certain elections. But even those modest gains were the product of decades of struggle by women's suffrage supporters. There were early events, such as the Women's Rights Convention convened in Seneca Falls,

New York, in 1848, and it helped encourage women's suffrage supporters to organize for full participatory rights throughout the State. And during the late 19th century, thousands of women's suffrage supporters nationwide marched, lobbied, and engaged in peaceful civil disobedience in the name of equal voting rights.

A resolution proposing an amendment extending the right of suffrage to women was first introduced in Congress in 1878, but it was not until 1916 that almost all major women's suffrage groups united behind a constitutional amendment. Yes, it was 42 years—even longer than it took to amend the Tennessee Constitution to get a lottery—42 years it took to get this amendment to a vote.

When New York enacted full women's suffrage in 1917 and President Woodrow Wilson announced his support for an amendment in 1918, the political tide finally turned in favor of a nationwide effort. And on June 4, 1919, the 66th Congress of the United States proposed to the legislatures of the several States the 19th Amendment to the Constitution.

A year later on August 20, 1920, Tennessee became that perfect 36th State to pass and ratify that amendment, thus fulfilling the three-fourth requirements.

Today, House Resolution 1375 honors the generation of women's suffrage activists who persevered through adversity and doubt to secure the rightful place of women in our democracy. This resolution also serves to reaffirm this body's commitment nine decades later pursuing policies that achieve true political and social equality for women.

□ 1620

There is, of course, in the Rotunda a statuary of some of the great leaders in this movement. And I think it took years to get that placed in the Capitol on the second floor in the Rotunda to honor their work.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his kind remarks about the 19th Amendment. And as the only woman in our Tennessee delegation, and on behalf of the women from Tennessee who have preceded me in service to this body, Louise Reece, Irene Baker, and Marilyn Lloyd, I treasure the role that our State played in ratifying the 19th Amendment. I will note that we still in Tennessee have not had a woman from our State serve in the Senate, in that body, nor have we had a female take the office of governor in our State.

We have all heard the story about that wonderful day in August 1920. And indeed, as Mr. COHEN was saying, it was a thrilling day in our State's history. This Chamber knows well the story of

Tennessee Representative Harry Burn and how he received that message, how he changed the rose on his lapel to a yellow rose, and then how he changed his vote. And that was a swing vote that did indeed change history.

I want to tell you about another swing vote that helped to set the stage in the suffrage story. And it is one that is important to our State of Tennessee, and it is one that transpired right here in this Chamber 91 years ago. Representative Thetus Sims was born in Wayne County, Tennessee. He lived in Savannah, Tennessee, and he practiced law over in Perry County, Tennessee. He later represented all of those counties and some others that today are represented by Mr. DAVIS and Mr. TANNER and Mr. GORDON, as well as the portions of his district I represent.

Now, Mr. Sims was the first Member of this Chamber to occupy 217 Cannon, which is the office that I now occupy in the Cannon House Office Building. Ninety-one years ago, before the 19th Amendment could go to the States for ratification, it had to be discharged from this Chamber. The first attempt to do that was in 1915, and it failed. Thetus Sims voted against the 19th Amendment at that point in time.

Well, he had the opportunity to vote again on the 19th Amendment in 1918. And it was a very dramatic day right here in this Chamber. It was perhaps one of the most important days that had transpired in this Chamber. Supporters of the amendment were unsure they had the votes to discharge the amendment. The galleries around us were packed with suffragettes. They were packed with journalists. Everyone was watching. On that day, Thetus Sims surprised the Nation.

Between 1915 and 1918, the suffrage movement had heated up not only here in D.C., but all across the Nation. Riots had broken out here in D.C., and women were jailed for wanting the right to vote. The D.C. commissioner who put them behind bars was a gentleman named Louis Brownlow. Louis Brownlow was Thetus Sims' son-in-law. With such influences, it is hard to see how Thetus Sims could see his way to vote "yes" on this amendment.

But Louis Brownlow wasn't the only person talking to Thetus Sims at the family dinner table. Congressman Sims also had daughters. And in Washington, the Sims daughters were known as consummate hostesses. Back in Tennessee, everyone knew them for being crack shots with their rifles. Well, here in D.C. Elizabeth Sims was a suffragist leader. And her arguments evidently beat out those of her husband, Louis Brownlow.

So the day finally came in 1918. And on his way to the vote, Thetus Sims took a very bad fall, and he broke his collarbone. He refused to have it set or to take pain killers for fear he would miss the vote. So, he came to the floor and he flipped his vote. He voted "aye," and he became the hero of the day.

Well, needless to say I am very proud of Thetus Sims' vote that day. I am grateful for how he represented Tennessee. And I am so pleased that he listened to his iron-jawed angel daughter, and that he voted for women. I am honored to represent much of that district now, and I am honored to occupy his office, 217 Cannon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Congresswoman BLACKBURN brings up some interesting history. And it reminds me Brownlow was probably related to Parson Brownlow, who was the somewhat reviled governor of Tennessee during the Civil War period. And Senator Henry said some very awful things about Governor Brownlow and the things he did to the women of Nashville and the jeopardy he placed them in. I am sure that was some kind of secondary reprisal as this relative of Brownlow jailed the women that wanted the vote. He had put the women in danger during the Civil War. And Senator Henry talked about that on many occasions on the floor, as I am sure you remember.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to acknowledge the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for her comments. You know, history is so important because it teaches us about the future. And we might think this is a 90-year-old piece of history dug up out of the past that we are just reflecting on. But we all know right now that it wasn't until this last three cycles that we had the election of the first woman Speaker of the House in the history of this great democracy, arguably one of the most powerful offices in the Constitution, leading the House of Representatives, Speaker NANCY PELOSI. And that one of the first items she had to take on as a Speaker was the passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Equal Pay Act. So you know, we are talking about 90 years ago, and yet up until this day we are still fighting about whether women ought to get equal pay for equal work. That was not something that was a fait accompli in terms of a bill that would have been passed.

But it just shows you we think we live in times where all of the great battles in the history of civil rights are behind us because they happened, oh, during the 1960s, or they happened back in the early 1920s, or they happened way back then. You know what? They're happening now.

We had an historic election in 2008, the election of the first African American President of the United States. When I go to my schools around my district, majority-minority, they finally say, "We belong in America." Because just as it was empowering for women to finally know they had a legal seat at the table, it wasn't just the legalese that mattered, it was the spirit of the law. And what matters is the

message that it sends to all of our people that this is a country that's in constant dynamic motion in terms of always trying to improve itself, expand the circle of opportunity for people who have been previously shunted aside in our country. And I think that it's a wonderful opportunity today to celebrate what makes us the greatest country on the face of the earth.

We might not always get it right, but we're going to get it right because we're a country that moves forward, that has progress, that's constantly striving to make it better. People put us down all over the world. They put us down here all over our own country. We're the greatest country in the world. We're the model where everywhere people want to come here because of things like we're celebrating today. Because you know what? For most people in the world the notion of a political right is a foreign notion. The notion of equal rights is a foreign notion. Human dignity, human rights are foreign notions.

We may not always get it right, but we ultimately will get it if we stick to it, and we remember things like this as guideposts as to how we need to continue the constant fight to move our country ever forward in the promise that Dr. King laid out in his "I Have a Dream" speech that we could all be treated as we ourselves would want to be treated someday. You know, because there but for the grace of God go each and every one of us. It's a human dignity issue.

□ 1630

One of the false things that keep us behind in life, perceptions, those are irrelevant when we talk about things like this because we finally recognize what makes our country great is we are not going to segregate, we are not going to discriminate. We are going to elevate every human being no matter their gender, their color, their creed, their disability or ability, for that matter.

This is a country that's about everybody. As this President said last week, it's not us versus them. In this country it's all us, Barack Obama, President of the United States, and, boy, is he right. Girl, is he right.

Thank God in America it doesn't matter if you are shut out because someday, because of our Constitution in this great country, we might be able to get a way in for everybody if they have something going against them. And the women fought the fight, African Americans, minorities, people with physical disabilities through the ADA. It's a constant fight. Everybody owes a debt of gratitude to everyone else for making our country a freer, more equal place for all people to live.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee, a former member of the Judiciary Committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1375, recognizing the 90th anniversary of the 19th Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 1375, which recognizes the 90th anniversary of the 19th Amendment and honors the contributions of women in United States politics.

The 19th Amendment prohibits the Federal Government and the States from denying a citizen's right to vote on account of sex. It was ratified on August 18, 1920.

For more than a century after our Nation's founding, women lacked the right to vote. However, throughout this time women participated in politics. Their many contributions paved the way for the eventual ratification of the 19th Amendment.

Many women played significant roles in the abolitionist movement, for example. It was after Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott were denied admission to an anti-slavery conference that they organized the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848.

The convention's Declaration of Sentiments stated that "all men and women are created equal." This served as a foundational document in the women's suffrage movement that followed.

After the 15th Amendment in 1870 outlawed the denial of a citizen's right to vote on account of race, women sought an amendment for women's suffrage.

Such an amendment would not come for another 50 years. During this period, women continued to remain active in politics. They voiced their concerns not only with regard to women's rights, but also on behalf of other causes such as the temperance movement.

In 1916, Jeannette Rankin, a Republican from Montana, was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. She became the first female Member of Congress. While many women still did not have the right to vote throughout the country, Montana afforded women the right to vote at that time.

Finally, in 1918 President Woodrow Wilson announced his support for a women's suffrage amendment. Congress passed the proposed amendment in 1919. On August 18, 1920, the Tennessee General Assembly became the 36th State legislature to ratify it, making it the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

In the decades that followed, women not only voted, but they slowly began to enter politics as State and Federal legislators and holders of elective executive posts.

In 1931, Hattie Wyatt Caraway (Democrat, Arkansas) was appointed to the U.S. Senate, succeeding her late husband. She later became the first woman ever elected to the Senate, where she served two full terms.

The women's rights movement grew significantly in the 1960s and 1970s. But in 1979, women still only occupied 3 percent of the seats in Congress, 10 percent of the seats in State legislatures, and 11 percent of statewide elective executive offices, according to the Center for American Women and Politics.

Today, while there is still room for much progress, women hold nearly 17 percent of the seats in Congress and the number of women in State legislatures and statewide elective offices has more than doubled.

House Resolution 1375 recognizes that the full participatory rights of women are vital to democracy in the United States.

This resolution honors the historic impact of the 19th Amendment and the achievements of women in politics.

It also reaffirms the commitment of the House of Representatives to pursuing this equality for women.

I am pleased to support this resolution. I urge my colleagues to share their support as well.

Mr. COHEN. I yield such time as he may consume to the author of this resolution, the gentleman who represents the area where this historic Amendment was passed in Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee, the Honorable JIM COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my colleagues. I appreciate their bipartisan effort on this important memorial resolution to honor Tennessee's historic role in making ratification of the Amendment possible.

I want to point out that the State of Tennessee played this pivotal role, and I think it's very appropriate that the House commemorate the 90th anniversary. I thank my colleagues for supporting this measure.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) for his leadership on this issue and for bringing forward this memorializing resolution for us to remind—it's a great way for us to continue to remind our citizens of the importance that our State played in passing the 19th Amendment. I thank Mr. COHEN for his leadership in managing the time and the preparation for presenting this Amendment today.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank Mr. COOPER for bringing this resolution. It's important that it be recognized on this occasion. I thank Mr. SMITH, who was a distinguished leader. We like to think of Texas as southwest Tennessee, because we did so much to create it. So you are like a cousin and part of this great celebration. And Congresswoman BLACKBURN, who served with me in the Senate, she brought up the singular vote. She brought up the second one. I thought she was going to bring up the lottery, where she was one of my essential 22, and I continue to thank her for that.

With the memory of Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony whose visages remain in the Rotunda, I would ask that we all vote positively in favor of this resolution and pass the resolution as presented here, H. Res. 1375. I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1375, a resolution celebrating the 90th anniversary of the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment and honoring the contributions and achievements of women in U.S. politics and reaffirming the commitment of the House of Representatives on its efforts to pursue policies that achieve true political and social equality for women.

As a strong supporter of equal rights, I am pleased to support this resolution commemorating the 90th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which extends suffrage to women. The ratification came 144 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence thanks to support from President Woodrow Wilson, the 66th Congress, and most importantly women's rights pioneers, who fought for women's suffrage for many decades.

As a husband, father of two daughters, and grandfather to granddaughters, I am pleased to live in a country that values the founding principle of equality. The passage of this resolution can also serve as a reminder that discrimination and inequality still exist and that we can always strive for a more perfect union. I urge the passage of H. Res. 1375.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the actions of the House of Representatives in recognizing the importance of the 90th anniversary of the 19th Amendment. I strongly support H. Res. 1375, which recognizes the significance of women fully participating in democracy in the United States, honors the contributions and achievements of women in United States politics, and reaffirms the House's commitment to political and social equality for all women.

On Election Day, in 1920, millions of American women had the chance to exercise their right to vote for the first time. Ninety years ago, on August 26, 1920, the 19th Amendment to our Constitution was ratified guaranteeing women the right to vote. As the House celebrates this special moment in history, it is important to remember the contributions of those leaders in the women's suffrage movement—Ilda B. Wells, and Alice Paul.

Some women, like Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Lucy Stone, were not alive in 1920 when women were granted the right to vote and participate in American politics. Nonetheless, they were women's rights activists who were at the heart of the women's suffrage movement. Their perseverance and persistence laid the ground work which led to the right of every American woman to vote.

While there is still work to be done, women have made tremendous strides toward equality in the United States. At this very moment, we have three women sitting on the Supreme Court of the United States, a female Secretary of State, and a strong woman serving as Speaker of the House. Women are in leadership positions all over the country. In my home State of Georgia, DeKalb District Attorney Gwen Keyes Fleming was recently appointed, by the President, to be the next Southeast Regional Administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Ultimately, women's rights are not just women's rights, but human rights that benefit the entire human race. This chamber must continue to ensure that equal rights apply to all Americans regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, or socioeconomic status.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 1375 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COHEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1375, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ADMINISTER THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE TO APPLICANTS FOR NATURALIZATION

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4862) to permit Members of Congress to administer the oath of allegiance to applicants for naturalization, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

(a) NATURALIZATION AUTHORITY.—Section 310(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1421(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “COURT AUTHORITY” and inserting “AUTHORITY”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by inserting “, by a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress,” before “or by an eligible court”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “A Senator shall have the authority to administer such oath of allegiance only to individuals who reside in the State the Senator represents. In the case of a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, the Member shall have the authority to administer such oath of allegiance only to individuals who reside in the congressional district the Member represents.”;

(3) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) LIMITATIONS ON CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY.—

“(i) EXTENT OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section of a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress is limited solely to the administration of the oath of allegiance under section 337(a).

“(ii) PERIOD BEFORE ELECTIONS.—A Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress may not administer the oath of allegiance under section 337(a) during the 90-day period which ends on the date of any election for Federal, State, or local office in which the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner is a candidate.

“(iii) TIME AND PLACE OF CEREMONY.—A Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress shall administer the oath of allegiance under section 337(a) only at such times and places as the Secretary of Homeland Security may designate.”;

(4) in paragraph (2)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “or a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress” after “a court”;

(5) in paragraph (2)(A)(i), by inserting “or subject to paragraph (1)(C)(ii), the Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress” after “the court”;

(6) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(I), by inserting “or the Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress” before “such information”;

(7) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(II), by inserting “or the Member of, or Delegate or Resident

Commissioner to, the Congress” after “the court”; and

(8) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “AUTHORITY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL” and inserting “TIMING OF EXCLUSIVE AUTHORITY”;

(B) by inserting “neither” after “Subject to subparagraph (C),”;

(C) by inserting “nor a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress” after “the Attorney General”; and

(D) by striking “shall not administer” and inserting “shall administer”.

(b) OATH OF RENUNCIATION AND ALLEGIANCE.—Section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by inserting “, the Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, who represents the congressional district in which the individual resides, a Senator who represents the State in which the individual resides,” before “or a court with jurisdiction”;

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “(except to the extent that such section limits the authority of a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress)” after “Notwithstanding section 310(b)”; and

(B) by inserting “, oath administration by the Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, who represents the congressional district in which the individual resides or a Senator who represents the State in which the individual resides,” after “expedited judicial oath administration ceremony”;

(3) in the third sentence of subsection (c), by inserting “or oath administration by the Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress” before the period; and

(4) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: “The authority under this section of a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress shall be subject to section 310(b).”.

(c) CERTIFICATE OF NATURALIZATION; CONTENTS.—Section 338 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1449) is amended by inserting “, Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress,” after “location of the official”.

(d) FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF CLERKS AND RECORDS OF DECLARATIONS OF INTENTION AND APPLICATIONS FOR NATURALIZATION.—Section 339 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1450) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) In the case of an oath administration by a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, the functions and duties of clerks of courts described in this section shall be undertaken by the Secretary of Homeland Security.”.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

Not later than the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue regulations implementing the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 3. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of sections 310, 337, 338, and 339 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1421, 1448, 1449, and 1450) is amended by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the authority of any officer or employee of the Executive Office of Immigration Review (including immigration judges (as defined in section 101(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act)) to

administer the oath of allegiance under section 337(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4862, introduced by Mr. SERRANO of New York, will allow Members of Congress to administer the oath of allegiance to naturalizing U.S. citizens.

The naturalization ceremony is a crucial landmark for immigrants. They have waited patiently to immigrate to the United States and have worked hard once they got here and have faithfully fulfilled all their obligations to this country that they have chosen to adopt as their home.

In applying to become U.S. citizens, they have made the choice to become full participating members of our community. Currently, only judges or certain officials in the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, are allowed to administer the oath of allegiance at naturalization ceremonies.

H.R. 4862 would allow Members of Congress to participate meaningfully in these solemn occasions by allowing them to administer the oath of allegiance at naturalization ceremonies. I have attended many. They are wonderful, heartfelt programs; and I think that the oath being given by a recognized public official such as a Member of Congress would mean much to the people that are becoming American citizens.

The bill, as amended, clarifies the role of a Member of Congress, the naturalization process that will be limited to administering the oath of allegiance. Furthermore, it prohibits a Member of Congress from administering the oath of allegiance within 90 days of any election in which he or she is a candidate to prevent even the appearance of any possible undue influence upon the election.

I commend our colleague, JOSÉ SERRANO, for his leadership in introducing this bill and thank Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH and Immigration Subcommittee Chair ZOE LOFGREN for their support of this measure. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment Congressman SERRANO for his creative idea to allow Members to administer the oath of allegiance to individuals being naturalized as citizens.

H.R. 4862 gives Members of Congress the ability to play a significant role in the naturalization ceremony, which can be and should be an inspiring experience for those becoming U.S. citizens.

Citizenship is the highest honor our Nation can bestow and naturalization ceremonies give us the opportunity to honor individuals who have come to contribute to America. Americans who take the oath of allegiance know the importance of swearing to "support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic." It is a solemn, yet joyful and patriotic, experience.

I appreciate the majority leader and Congressman SERRANO making some improvements to the initial bill. The revised language clarifies that Members, whether Representatives or Senators, can only administer the oath to individuals from their own congressional district or, in the case of Senators, from their own State.

In order to prevent this privilege from being used for political purposes, no Member can administer the oath of allegiance during the 90 days prior to any election in which that Member is a candidate. The 90-day period parallels the House rules that prohibit House-funded mailings 90 days before an election.

And, finally, I requested that language be added to ensure that the Member can only administer the oath at a naturalization ceremony set up, conducted, and overseen by the Department of Homeland Security, which is the current practice.

The many redrafts of the language do show why legislation should be subjected to proper process where Members can participate in hearings and learn from experts in the issue area.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which gives Members of Congress the ability to more fully participate in naturalization ceremonies. It is appropriate for Members of Congress, who wrote our naturalization laws, to play an expanded role in helping individuals become a part of the most free and most prosperous country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of this legislation, Mr. SERRANO of the great State of New York and the home of the Yankees and Frank Sinatra across the river.

□ 1640

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I thank Mr. SMITH for his kind words and his sup-

port of the bill and his suggestions to change the bill.

Any Member of Congress, any American for that matter, who has ever been to one of these ceremonies knows that there is no greater joy seen anywhere than when folks dress up and come with their American flags to become American citizens. It is really a wonderful event. I have had the opportunity to attend a few and have seen the joy and the pride. Usually, one person is becoming a citizen, but he or she will bring 25 members of the family, whether they are citizens or not, because it is that kind of an occasion.

It is also an occasion where they, for the first time, really get to see government up close in that the people that are invited there are from the community, but they are government officials and so on. So up to now—if this bill becomes law—the only people allowed to administer the oath, as has been said, are judges or members of the administration. This bill would allow Members of Congress and Senators to administer that oath.

Now, while the bill does not speak directly to this issue, I will tell you how this idea came about. A member of my community came to me and said, Guess what? I'm going to become a citizen, and I want you to swear me in. I want you to administer the oath.

And I was touched. I said, My God, that you would want me to help you become an American, something that I and so many of us have by birth, since birth, it's a great honor for me.

Then it dawned on me. I said, I should check with staff to see if I'm allowed to do this. And I found out that I'm not allowed to do it.

Now, it won't be that it would take care of that situation of one individual asking for it, but as has been said here, we will not—and this is the change Mr. SMITH was so good at including. We will be invited to ceremonies, as we are now. The ceremonies will be set up by Homeland Security. We will not pick the date, the place, or who is going to get sworn in. But when we're invited now, the possibility is open for the administration officials to say, Why don't you join us in administering the oath, or, Why don't you administer the oath.

And I will tell you again that I don't know that there is a greater honor for someone to become a citizen and a greater honor for us on some occasions to be able to administer the oath. So the changes that are made, because there will be some questions about it, I think are strong changes. They comply with rules that say that none of these ceremonies should ever be politicized. But I really think that as people are being sworn in, to have present a Senator, a Member of Congress, and every so often to have them administer the oath only strengthens the bond between these new Americans and their government, a fuller understanding. After all, we are a question on the immigration test. A lot of people don't know that one of the questions on the

immigration test is: Who is your Congressman? Do you know who your Congressman is? Some don't pass that question; others do pass.

It is a great honor. There is not much more to say. It is a simple thought that should have been taken care of a long time ago, and I'm looking forward to the day when I'm invited to a ceremony and I can administer the oath to someone.

So I thank all the Members, and I hope that this bill can pass and become law.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY. I just want to take this opportunity to thank you for your work on making sure that those who are American citizens, over 4½ million Americans are Americans but don't enjoy the full rights of Americans because of where they live, on an island called Puerto Rico, where people think that you need a passport to get there. It is an American territory. And by virtue of being a territory, people on Puerto Rico do not have full voting rights power.

And your work not just on this, what may be considered a ceremonial thing, but your work to ensure this country fulfills its obligations to treat all Americans with full liberty and their enfranchisement granted under the Constitution is so much something I think needs to be acknowledged. It's great to swear people in, but let's make sure we also guarantee those rights that we already guaranteed Americans, like the 4 million Americans in Puerto Rico or those who live here in the District of Columbia or in any of the territories around the world that are of American domain.

Mr. SERRANO. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman brings up an interesting point that we have discussed at other times on this floor.

I must say that I neglected to mention that the bill also includes Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to be able to administer the oath of office. So, interestingly enough, in the territories, new Americans will become citizens on that day with the participation of the Resident Commissioner or the Delegates.

So, again, thank you. And all this is an extension of the celebration of, as you have said, Mr. SMITH, probably the greatest honor this country gives anyone, which is to become an American citizen. Thank you so much.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment Congressman SERRANO and Congressman KENNEDY as well. They so beautifully described why these naturalization ceremonies are so important and why they are so meaningful to our newest citizens.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. I yield back the balance of my time and ask that we pass the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4862, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE DOGS

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1614) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that law enforcement service dogs and their handlers perform a vital role in providing for our Nation's security and should be recognized for their service.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1614

Whereas everyday across the ranks of Federal, State, local, and military law enforcement agencies, service dogs perform a variety of functions to prevent and solve crimes and to ensure the public safety;

Whereas service dogs trained to detect bombs, accelerants, and other weapons can often discover these dangerous devices at airports, train stations, sporting events and many other locations before they are used, preventing mass casualties, and sometimes their mere presence at these locations can prevent dangerous situations;

Whereas service dogs trained to detect narcotics and other contraband are used at our Nation's borders and ports of entry to identify illegal drugs and smuggled goods;

Whereas service dogs and their handlers perform crucial functions in special operations, including crowd control, search and rescue missions, locating missing persons, and tactical building entries, and these service dogs often work in undesirable conditions for little more than food and the affection of their handler;

Whereas service dogs can detect the presence of human remains in operations to locate victims in disaster recovery operations;

Whereas service dogs are used to protect the House of Representatives and Senate chambers, the White House, the Supreme Court, and many other public buildings in Washington, DC, and throughout the country;

Whereas many dogs have given their lives in the performance of these duties; and

Whereas these dogs have become an integral component of modern law enforcement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) these dogs perform extraordinary services using their special sensory and physical abilities. Their service is rendered with incredible efficiency and dedication and is an important contribution to the security and public safety of our Nation; and

(2) we all owe a debt of gratitude and our sincere appreciation to the loyal service performed by the law enforcement service dogs and their handlers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1614 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that police service dogs and their handlers perform a critical role in ensuring our national security and deserve to be recognized for their service.

Federal, State, local, and military law enforcement agencies work with service dogs to perform a variety of tasks to prevent and solve crimes and to keep the public safe. Search and rescue dogs often perform a number of functions, such as searching for victims in avalanches, collapsed buildings, and people missing in the wilderness.

□ 1650

Service dogs are also used to capture escaped offenders or suspects from crime scenes. These dogs are trained to search for items bearing human scent and are utilized in crime scenes to find evidence thrown away by a suspect.

In addition, dogs are trained to search through buildings, cars, and luggage, and can alert on more than one kind of drug despite the best efforts of smugglers.

Law enforcement service dogs can be trained to alert on guns and bomb-making materials. And often these dogs deter dangerous crimes at sporting events, train stations, airports, and other places by their mere presence.

Due to the dangerous situations these dogs and their handlers are frequently put in, many dogs have given their lives in the performance of their duties.

Today, this resolution recognizes the extraordinary efforts and dedication of these service dogs and their handlers.

Mr. Speaker, my first bill I had as a State senator in 1983 was one to make it a crime to shoot a police service dog, and to make it such because to shoot the dog was really to shoot at law enforcement personnel to try to stop that policeman from having that dog in the pursuit of its duty, and the next bullet would be for the officer. Of course they are valuable and important.

I commend Mr. COBLE for bringing this bill recognizing the contribution that these dogs make to our society and to police practices. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some recent years ago, Mr. Speaker, I rode with a K-9 handler and his dog in my district during a regular routine run, and he told me that his children regarded that dog as a sibling. The dog lived in the home of the Handler. Some days after I rode with him, I read where the dog had been struck by an automobile and killed. And I called my friend, and he made it clear to me that they had lost a family member, so I appreciate the gentleman's comments from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, law enforcement officers face extraordinary danger each and every day, as we all know, in their service to our country in their quest to keep us all safe. For that I am sure we are all eternally grateful.

We should also be reminded of the very special service, the tremendous work, and the dedication to duty rendered by a very special partner in the protection of our safety and freedoms, the law enforcement service dog. These K-9s and their handlers risk their lives to make our communities and our country safe, protecting us from crime and from terrorism.

Using their heightened sensory abilities, these dogs oftentimes are able to detect narcotics, bombs, and other contraband that are not visible to humans. Law enforcement dogs participate in dangerous operations, sparing their human partners the danger of entering a dark and unsearched or unsecured building. Others are trained for and have proven to be very successful at locating missing persons or detecting human remains. These very special K-9s are becoming more and more visible at major transportation hubs, and can be seen daily right here on the Capitol grounds examining vehicles as they enter secured parking areas.

The role of the K-9's handler should not go unmentioned as well. While a police officer may work a particular shift and then go home, the job of a K-9 handler is a 24 hour a day commitment. The handler often cares for his or her dog even when the dog has retired from active service.

Many K-9s have died while valiantly protecting their handlers in the performance of their duties, not unlike the case I mentioned at the outset. The bond between a dog and their handler is great, and the sense of loss when a dog expires is even greater.

There are least 80 organizations at the local, regional, national, and international level devoted to law enforcement service dogs. The Connecticut Police Work Dog Association lists over 1,500 police and military service dogs that have died while "in-service." Many of these were "in the line of duty" deaths. The individual stories of these dogs are inspiring and range from the very public event of the World Trade Center collapse of 9/11/01, where Sirius, a bomb-sniffing dog, perished when the building collapsed. The in-

scription on Sirius' steel bowl: "I gave my life so that you may save others," sums up the loyalty and the dedication that is typical of these dogs to their handlers.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the gentleman from Tennessee in supporting this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) to speak on behalf of man's best friend.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank Mr. COBLE for his bill.

Service dogs, yes, they do a lot of really important functions, among which is to provide service and support for our veterans. We just expanded last year the definition of those eligible for service dogs to those suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder because these animals know when these veterans are in crisis and they can help get them out of the house, they can help them not only see when they can't see, as we commonly associate service dogs to be sight for the blind, but now these service dogs are doing a lot of things in addition to helping in our law enforcement.

I love the term "to detect," to search and rescue. I only wish our country had that attitude when it came to our Nation's heroes who are suffering from these neurological disorders of blindness, of TBI, of post-traumatic stress, because they need more than just service dogs. They need us to go in there and unlock the mysteries that are keeping them held hostage to the disability of their service to our country. The constant IED attacks and concussions on the brain that are going to cause a permanent, unless we step in and save them, permanent disability for these veterans.

We have an opportunity. We talked about civil rights, voting rights. This is the biggest civil rights fight for our day and generation, those with neurological disorders, for those suffering in their minds. We don't see it, and so we don't take it seriously. The fact is they need someone to come in and set them free from being prisoners of their war injuries. We need to be the first responders in the next couple of years, dedicate ourselves to saying while combat operations are over in Iraq, the war hasn't ended for these veterans. It is just beginning as they face the disabilities that they have incurred, suffering by their sacrifice to our country.

So we talk about how great service dogs are in so many respects. Let's put those service dogs out of business. Let's restore the eyesight of our veterans. The biggest TBI, traumatic brain injury, is lost eyesight. The biggest TBI confusion, loss of memory, loss of ability to go outside. These dogs are bringing them out into the real world. Let's not allow us to be having to rely on others to support these veterans. Let's restore their brain capac-

ities by investing in stem cell research. Let's restore their functions by making sure that we invest in all of the genetic trip wire identifications so they don't have to get Alzheimer's 20 years prior to the average American, which is what all neuroscientists say these veterans are going to be facing if we don't step in soon. They don't have to get Parkinson's disease because we are not doing anything.

Let's get in there, and in the words of my uncle, President Kennedy, when we talked about civil rights, he said, Who amongst us would be willing to abide by the counsels of patience and delay, and trade the color of their skin for someone else's, and abide by those laws back in the 1960s?

Well, now, who amongst us would trade places with these suffering TBI victims, these veterans, and say we can't do better to bring you home, not only in body when you get home from your war serving our country, but in mind? Because we know the suicide rates are off the charts, unacceptable. We know that what they are facing is unacceptable, and we need to be the ones who come in and shed some light on their lives so they don't have to rely on service dogs.

□ 1700

We don't have to rely on anything else but their potential to live their own independent lives free for themselves, without any dependence on anybody else, and we can do that if we put our commitment out there, professing like we did today that we care about our first responders. Hey, let's put it into action and invest in these things that will bring our veterans home, not only in body but in mind.

In the meantime, we can make sure they have service dogs, for which this Congress provided \$5 million to expand the definition of those who are suffering from other neurological disorders other than eyesight loss. That's a good thing, but let's not make it the answer, the Band-Aid. Let's get to the real solution and save these veterans from being held hostage to their terminal situations, which would not be terminal if we would dedicate ourselves to intervening and intervening soon on their behalf.

I thank my colleagues for letting me explain myself with respect to these service dogs, because they do a lot of good things, but we need to make sure our people are also given some support and independence by their not having to rely on dogs in the future.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. I just want to thank Mr. COBLE for bringing the bill.

As I said, I know from where he comes. That was my first bill. I started as a police attorney, and I know about police dogs and about the bonds between policemen and their K-9 companions. They do a tremendous service, and they ought to be protected and respected. I ask that we vote in unanimous support of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1614.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4785, RURAL ENERGY SAVINGS PROGRAM ACT

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-594) on the resolution (H. Res. 1620) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4785) to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce home energy use, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IN MEMORIAM: USMC STAFF SERGEANT MICHAEL A. BOCK

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, he was called "a young man of integrity and respect," "a great marine who loved the Marine Corps," "a loving husband and father." This is how the late Staff Sergeant Michael A. Bock was remembered by those who knew him.

Staff Sergeant Bock was conducting combat operations in the Helmand province in Afghanistan when his patrol came under fire. He died from those injuries on August 13. He had served four deployments in both Iraq and Afghanistan and was awarded the Purple Heart, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals, and the Combat Action Ribbon.

He was raised in Springfield, Nebraska, and attended Elkhorn's Mount Michael High School, where he met his future wife, Tiffany. Tiffany and Michael also had a 3-year-old son, Zander. Zander's birth, Michael said, was the happiest moment of his life. While in Afghanistan, he watched online as his son blew out three birthday candles; and for Valentine's Day, he recorded a message and sent it to his young son. Now I'm certain that Zander will always carry his father's voice in his heart.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Nation, I offer my condolences to the

Bock family. May God bless Staff Sergeant Bock and grant eternal life unto him.

FALLEN SOLDIER—ARMY SPECIALIST CHAD CLEMENTS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Army Specialist Chad Derek Clements, 26 years old, died on Monday, August 30, 2010, while serving his country in Afghanistan. He was one of my constituents.

He was born on March 16, 1984, in San Diego, California. After he graduated from Huntington North High School in Huntington, Indiana, he decided he wanted to proudly serve in the U.S. Army. Upon his graduation from basic training, Chad reported to the 1st Armored Battalion at Fort Carson, Colorado; and he was deployed shortly after to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

During Chad's distinguished career, he received multiple awards for his service: the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, the NATO International Security Assistance Force Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, and the Combat Action Badge.

He has also recently been posthumously promoted from private first class to Army specialist. His expertise and enthusiasm for his job in the United States Army was insurmountable.

To the citizens of the State of Indiana, to his fellow troops and to the countless people that he touched, Chad will forever be remembered as a hero.

He was preceded in death by his father, Daniel, and our thoughts, prayers and deepest condolences go out to his mother, Anne; to his stepfather, Eddie; to his sister, Danielle; to his stepbrother, Cory; and to his stepsister, Heather.

These are some of the things we hate to talk about on this floor, Mr. Speaker; but, unfortunately, war brings us to these kinds of conclusions. We just wish that all of those like Chad will never be forgotten for the service they gave to our country.

IN HONOR OF THE HEROIC EFFORTS OF RESOURCE OFFICER CAROLYN GUDGER

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Kingsport, Tennessee, Sullivan Central High School Resource Officer Carolyn Gudger and the efforts of all the officers and staff who acted quickly to keep all students and faculty safe from a gunman on August 30, 2010.

A gunman entered the school and immediately aimed a handgun at the school principal. Officer Gudger moved herself between the principal and the gunman and then managed to lure the gunman to a more isolated area of the school. Two deputies responding to the call shot the gunman after he refused to release his weapon.

These actions, thankfully, prevented the gunman from killing or injuring anyone. Too often we've seen situations exactly like this end in a tragic fashion. That is precisely why we should commend and honor Officer Gudger and everyone involved in responding to that incident.

Most especially, I would like to thank my good friend, Sheriff Wayne Anderson, who is in charge of these officers. All of these individuals make our community proud, and I salute them for their courage and good work that they do each and every day.

□ 1710

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ETHERIDGE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CALLING FOR EXTENSION OF TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, after traveling my district over the August work period, it is clear that my constituents' top concern are jobs and the economy. These are the same concerns they have raised for nearly 2 years since I have been in Congress, indicating that not enough has been done to get Americans back to work.

They also expressed deep worry that the tax relief passed in 2001 and 2003 will soon expire. In an economy still struggling to recover, allowing taxes to increase on nearly all Americans is unacceptable.

Though many in Washington seem to have just awakened to the idea that tax cuts are going to go up next year unless action is taken, I took the lead as far back as January in calling for the current tax rates to be extended for 2 years as a way to ensure economic stability.

Our economy is in trouble. We need to stabilize it and give it some opportunity to get back on its feet and move forward. There is widespread, bipartisan consensus for some of these tax

breaks to be temporarily extended. Instead of using the issue to score political points, let's come together and find a way to extend these tax breaks for 2 years and revisit the issue when the economy is on better footing. It is the least we can do to provide economic stability in an otherwise unstable time. We need to work for America for a change, not for party labels. You can't tell me that all Republicans are right and all Democrats are wrong. We need to come together as Americans and stabilize our economy for the long-term benefit of our country as a whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRAGEDY IN SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday September 9, 2010, at a few minutes before 6:30, life changed forever in San Bruno, California. The first view from my district office led one of my staffers to believe a plane had crashed in the hills. After all, San Francisco International is in my district and airline jets fly over nearby San Francisco International Airport routinely passing over San Bruno every day.

The flames shot up over 100 feet in the air. But after 15 minutes, the flames didn't subside. It was as if a giant torch had been placed on what is normally a verdant hillside.

This was a distant view of the PG&E natural gas pipeline explosion. Closer up, the scene was horrific. Four confirmed dead. Scores of people hospitalized with second- and third-degree burns, some over 50 percent of their bodies. And 6 days after this tragedy, three people are still missing. Thirty-seven homes were completely destroyed—nothing but concrete pads left, or a weeping chimney, indicating what once had been. Twelve homes were standing shells and another 10 were damaged.

We are at day six. The smoke has cleared. The ash has settled. And one thing is really very clear: the community of San Bruno rose together. Mayor Jim Ruane, City Manager Connie Jackson, Police Chief Neil Telford and Fire Chief Dennis Haag all showed extraordinary leadership and courage in bring-

ing this community together and securing the flames within a box so that more homes were not destroyed and more lives destroyed as a result.

But on other fronts, questions remain—in fact they are multiplying—about the causes of this immense pain and suffering that has been visited upon San Bruno and surrounding areas. But no question—I repeat no question—has been more penetrating to me than asked by Sue Bullis a day after the explosion. I walked into the center that was set up to establish relief and support for the families and sitting at a table by herself looking distant was this woman. She looked at me and said she couldn't locate her mother-in-law, she couldn't locate her husband, she couldn't locate her son. Six days later, they still have not been found.

The explosion was so hot that glass windshields on cars melted. Bones have been found. The blast epicenter functioned as a crematorium. And through it all, hour after hour, Sue Bullis, who lived at 1690 Claremont, is hoping and praying for an answer. She lost her house. All her documents. She has nothing but hope. And now that hope will have to be converted to inner strength if she is to go on.

I will help Sue get her documents, her insurance payments from PG&E, and I will try to ease her pain just as thousands of others are helping to ease the pain caused by this explosion. But nothing is going to relieve the pain that she has coping with the loss of three of her family members.

On Friday, we will bury Jacqueline and Janessa Grieg. Ironically, Jacqueline Grieg worked at the California Public Utilities Commission in the gas pipeline area. Her daughter Janessa was an eighth grader at St. Cecilia School in San Francisco. She was also the student body president of that grammar school. On Saturday, we will bury Jessica Morales, the fiancée of a young man who is now in intensive care with 50 percent of his body burned. Jessica was just coming into her own, finding her way, finding work and employment and opportunities at school. We have just found out that Elizabeth Torres, an 81-year-old mother who has two family members still in the burn unit, has passed away, and she too will be remembered as well.

People are anxious to return to their homes, to retrieve those belongings that remain. Some may want to rebuild. A few may not. We face months and months of hard work, but at this moment, this very moment, I bow my head in silence for the family of Sue Bullis, Jacqueline Grieg, Janessa Grieg, Jessica Morales, and Elizabeth Torres.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SHATAVIA ANDERSON—MURDER VICTIM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. In early August, August 7 to be exact, in Houston, Texas, right after the sun had gone down, about 9 o'clock p.m. on a hot summer night, a young girl was walking home. Shatavia Anderson. She went by Ta. And she was walking down the street not far from where she lived in a very modest community; 14-year-old, happy, spirited child.

She was confronted by two individuals who ambushed her, who taunted her, who robbed her, and as she tried to get away, one of them shot her in the back and murdered her not far from where she lived. This is who Ta was. This is her in the pink. She is next to her mother, Keisha Lambert. She's a real person, Mr. Speaker, a real victim of criminal conduct, died in the early teenage years. Ta's father, Leroy Anderson, said that his beautiful daughter loved life. And you can tell by looking at her that she is a happy, spirited child.

□ 1720

It could have been any of our children.

Over the years in my career as a judge in the courthouse in Houston, Texas—22 to be exact—I've seen a lot of criminal cases, tried a lot, came across many victims, but this case has bothered me a great deal. I don't know the reason, maybe it's because I have four children—three of them are girls—eight grandkids—five of them are girls, but this one has bothered me a lot just by looking at who this young lady was. Ambushed by two individuals that were caught by the Houston Police Department, Melvin Alvarado, he was the cowardly shooter who shot her in the back. It is not his first experience with the criminal justice system in business Texas. He likes to drink and drive. It turns out, of course, like some others, he was illegally in the United States. He had been deported twice before to his native country of El Salvador, but that didn't make any difference to him. He came back to Houston and committed this crime and robbed this precious child of not only some money, but he stole her life when he came back and shot her in the back not far from where she lived.

There was another individual, Jonathan Lopez-Torres, the getaway driver of the car as they snuck away in the darkness of the night after murdering this beautiful child; he's from Honduras, although he was legally in the United States. He had been arrested for auto theft. The Houston Police Department said when these criminals were arrested they showed no remorse, no sadness, almost arrogant in the crime that they committed here in the United States. Melvin Alvarado confessed to this crime and told the police what he had done.

Joe Lambert, the uncle of Ta, said this about this crime: "Illegals are a big problem in Houston. It is really senseless what happened to my niece, and I don't like it. They are starting to come over here and they do whatever they want to do. What is happening is they are given the green light and saying to the rest of us, hey, you can do whatever you want." Yes, that's what these two arrogant criminals did, but they can do whatever they want. They wanted a little property from this young lady, they shot her because she tried to get away. These are real people, real children, real victims of crime.

The duty of government, Mr. Speaker, is to protect the public. That's why we have government, to protect us. The national government has failed totally in protecting people in the United States from those criminals who come over here to commit crime. We give a wink and a nod to border security, but it doesn't happen. They cross back and forth, they get caught, they get sent back home, they come over again because the border is not secure, Mr. Speaker. It's time for the Federal Government to secure the border so more children don't get murdered by those illegals who come over here for the purpose of committing crime. I'm certainly not talking about all people who come here illegally, but we are talking about one child that was murdered by one.

The answer is not, of course, amnesty—as some advocate in this House who know nothing about the real world—the answer is securing the border by putting the National Guard on the border immediately to prevent people from crossing, and make sure that when we deport those people, they don't come back to the United States.

These individuals, Alvarado, stole the most precious thing we have, that is a human life. No parent wants to lose their child before its time, and the worst thing that can happen is for us to see a child die. And when this young lady was murdered by these criminals, they stole everything she was and everything she will be, and that ought not to be. That should hopefully make us, as a body, do something about cross-border crime. The time is now. And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA NEEDS ECONOMIC RECOVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say, before I start my 5-minute Special Order, Mr. Speaker, that I concur with what my colleague from Texas (Mr. POE) just said. There are innumerable crimes that are being committed by people who are illegal aliens. And he is absolutely correct, we've got to secure that border, and we need to do whatever is necessary. The President of the

United States has the responsibility to protect that border, and he needs to get on with it.

States like Arizona and other States are very concerned about what is going on. There is a sign 80 miles north of the Mexican border in Arizona that says don't go south of here because it's not safe. That's unconscionable. The American people should not have to worry when they are in their own country about terrorists or criminals coming across the border from another country to kill them. So I would just like to say to Mr. POE that I really appreciate your comments.

Let me just say in my Special Order, there was a book called "A Tale of Two Cities" by Charles Dickens that said "It was the best of times and it was the worst of times." I heard some of my colleagues on the other side saying earlier tonight that we really ought to do something about extending the tax cuts that are in place that were put there during the Bush administration. We really need to do that. If you're one of the 10 percent that are unemployed or one of the 15 or 16 percent that are unemployed or unemployable right now, you realize how really bad it is.

We live in the greatest country on the face of the Earth in the history of the Earth, so from that standpoint it is the best of times. But for those who are out of work and struggling right now, it is the worst of times. I had town meetings this past week, and I can't tell you how many people told me how bad it was and how soon they were going to lose their jobs, or their husbands or wives had lost their jobs and they're suffering, so what we need to do is take the steps necessary to bring about economic recovery.

As I've said many times on this floor, when Ronald Reagan took office in the early eighties, he came in, and instead of raising taxes he cut taxes and we had 20 years of prosperity. We had 12 percent unemployment and 14 percent inflation. And what happened was he came in, and when they said he had to raise taxes in order to get the economy moving, he did just the opposite and the economy took off. That's what we ought to be doing today.

If I could talk to the President—and I know I can't because I'm here on the floor—I would say, Mr. President, look at history. Look at John F. Kennedy, a great Democrat President, and look at Ronald Reagan—who I think was the greatest Republican President in our lifetime—and see what they did to bring about economic recovery, and that is, cut taxes, cut government spending, move the country in the right direction, even if it's just for a couple of years that we have the tax cuts in place. But right now is the wrong time to be increasing taxes or letting the Bush tax cuts expire.

And I don't want to be political, but I think I have to say to my colleagues who may be paying attention in their offices right now, there will be a price to be paid in about 6 weeks for those

who don't heed the message that is coming from the American people. They want economic recovery, and they understand what needs to be done. And they're going to hold those of us who don't listen to them accountable on November 2.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING UNITED STATES ARMY CAPTAIN DALE A. GOETZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, United States Army Captain Dale A. Goetz, an Air Force veteran with ties to Colorado, joined the Army's chaplaincy out of a strong desire to help others.

Captain Dale Goetz and his wife Christy both graduated from Maranatha Baptist Bible College in 1995. He was a former pastor of First Baptist Church in White, South Dakota before being stationed at military bases throughout the world.

Earlier this year, Captain Goetz was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 66th Armor Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division at Fort Carson, Colorado, and the family moved to Colorado Springs in January of 2010. This allowed his wife Christy and their sons Landon, Caleb and Joel to be closer to his mother, Hope Goetz, an Elbert County commissioner.

Captain Goetz and his family joined High Country Baptist Church in Colorado Springs the day before he deployed to Afghanistan. Captain Goetz, who had previously served in Iraq, cared about the soldiers he worked with as an Army chaplain, and according to his pastor at High Country Baptist Church in Colorado Springs, his goal as a chaplain was not to be a social worker but to be a spiritual guide. Captain Goetz is described as having "a calm demeanor that helped soldiers find strength in the darkest of times," according to Reverend Stuart Schwenke, a fellow pastor he had gone through ministerial training with.

On August 30, 2010, Captain Goetz was on a mission in Arghandab River Valley, Afghanistan when insurgents attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device which detonated near their military vehicle.

□ 1730

Captain Goetz was gravely wounded and died of injuries sustained during the attack. Four of his fellow soldiers from Fort Carson, Colorado, were also killed in action as a result of the incident.

Captain Dale A. Goetz is a shining example of the United States Army's service and sacrifice. As a former member of the United States Army and a retired Marine Corps combat veteran, my deepest sympathies go out to his mother, Hope Goetz, an Elbert County

Commissioner; his wife, Christy; their sons, Landon, Caleb, and Joel; and his sisters, Ann Senetar and Kim Sumner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I will engage in a colloquy here, with the permission of the Chair, with my colleagues to discuss an extremely important issue for America—that is, manufacturing. If America is going to make it, we're going to have to make it in America.

But before I go into the subject of how we can restart and rebuild the American manufacturing sector and make it in America, I'd like to do a little review of history first.

Years and years ago, I played football at the University of California. And it's football season, and my friends have often accused me of using football analogies, and, well, it happens to be true. So, okay, it's football season.

Let's consider for a moment that it's not football that we're dealing with but, rather, it's the economy. And if we were to consider the first quarter, we

would have to look at the George W. Bush and the Republican first quarter. What happened?

Beginning in 2007, we began to see the extraordinary crash of the American economy. It just bled jobs. Eight million jobs were lost, peaking in December of 2008, just before the onset of the Obama administration. Nearly 800,000 jobs were lost that month alone, totaling 8 million during that period of time. So you see this incredible decline in the American job market, and this is just the private employment sector. This was replicated in the public sector also.

So that was the first quarter. How did it happen? Why did it happen?

Well, crazy tax policy for starts. Tax policies that gave extraordinary breaks to the very wealthy; modest breaks to the middle class; two wars that were not paid for, the money was borrowed; the Medicare drug benefit, not paid for, creating an enormous deficit and the regulators stepped back. The period of no regulation occurred during that first quarter. Wall Street went crazy. It collateralized debt obligations. The meltdown of the housing industry, subprime loans. All of those things led to this extraordinary decline.

In January of 2009, President Obama came in and we began the second quarter. Tough situation going into that second quarter, but we began to see immediate action taken. The Wall Street stabilization programs went into effect, and the way in which that was administered began to stabilize Wall Street. We had the stimulus program, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It went into effect. And we saw numerous other pieces of legislation go into effect during the Obama second quarter.

I'm going to go through some of these very, very quickly.

The stimulus program, 3 million jobs as a direct result of that since it went into effect in February of 2009.

We saw also the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act dealing with the foreclosures, trying to keep people in their homes and to provide tax relief for small businesses.

We saw the Student Aid and Financial Responsibility Act, the biggest effort since the GI Bill in the 1940s and 1950s, to give people an opportunity to get job training and to get new skills when they got back into the job market.

Cash for Clunkers, stabilizing the automobile industry.

And we also saw the American Government stepping in to save two great icons of the American industry and the hundreds, in fact, thousands of small businesses that depended upon the auto industry with the bailout of General Motors and Chrysler—to good effect. We were able to maintain those small business jobs that were directly impacted there.

We also saw the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights. How many of us have reached into our pockets for our credit

cards and we go, "I just know those banks are going to screw me one more time." But no more, because we passed the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights.

Other legislation is now pending. All of those are laws.

And one that passed just 3 weeks ago, which was the teachers and the medical legislation, that went into effect fully paid for; 160,000 teachers across the United States will stay in the classrooms providing that education that our students need, and paid for by ending an extraordinarily bad piece of policy that's been in effect for many years that gave a tax break to American corporations that off-shored American jobs.

So what do you mean? Do you mean to tell me that American corporations were able to get a tax break every time they sent a job offshore? Yes. That's exactly what is over today as a result of action taken.

On every one of these bills, every single effort made by this Congress to bring jobs back, to stabilize the economy, we found virtually no Republican support. In the stimulus, none at all. In the credit card, only a handful of Republicans. Republican opposition was uniform for every single effort made by this House, by the Democrats.

The result of our work without Republican support has been a steady improvement, so that for the last 8 months we have seen private sector jobs actually increase—not as much as we need, not as much as we want, but we have seen a clear differentiation between the first quarter with the Bush debacle and the rebuilding of the American economy in the second quarter.

Where are we today? We're at halftime. We're in the locker room here in Washington, D.C. We're in Congress. We're working to complete our plan for the second half—the resurgence and the rebuilding of the American economy. And in this half, we have a series of bills that we put forward—some already law; others that will go into effect in the months ahead—hopefully passed. We'd love to have the support of our Republican colleagues, but, as in this moment, their seats are empty. But when they're filled, they still vote "no" on every effort to rebuild the American economy.

So it's halftime. The question for the American public is: Which team's going to go back on the field for the second half, for 2011 and 2012? Which team's going back on the field? The team that brought us this great debacle, the great crash of the American economy, or the team that has slowly, but every month, brought progress back to the American economy? We're talking now about making it in America.

Joining me today for this discussion is my colleague from the great State of Wisconsin, Dr. KAGEN, an extraordinary individual, an entrepreneur in his own right, who is going to talk about some of the efforts that he's

made and some of the issues that face his district in making it in America and the things that we need to do.

Dr. KAGEN from Wisconsin.

□ 1740

Mr. KAGEN. Absolutely. Well, thank you very much for yielding, and thank you for organizing this hour, where we can begin to have a conversation, a very constructive conversation with the American people across the country about making it in America. And you know, manufacturing does matter. And making it in America really is important. And just maybe, perhaps we should change the slogan from "Make It In America" and add on, "not China."

Because where I live people say, "Hey, Doc, we have got to get our jobs back from China. We want our money back from Wall Street and our jobs back from China." And one of my constituents, who is nearly 80 years old, sent me this note asking really the question about whose side are we on? You mention it's a ball game, a football game. Could be peewee, could be little league, could be NFL. Look, we're all on the same team. We're all in the same boat, the same canoe. And amazing things will happen when we begin to paddle in the same direction. We got to work together to get through the most difficult economic time of our generation.

Elaine from Peshtigo wrote me this note: "I am soon an 80-year old woman and a widow. My husband and I farmed, and we certainly had hard times the first years. But the years now are harder for old people. Oil companies take a huge profit. The CEOs make a salary no man on earth is worth. Pill companies are taking huge profits with no consideration for old people. The people of my generation lived through the Depression, World War II, and two more wars. And now in our old age we face other obstacles."

Well, Elaine, we are working hard to rebuild our economy. We are working hard to generate the jobs we need to work our way back into prosperity. One way that we've done it is to pass an essential bill on health care legislation. We now have a new health care law that guarantees that, Elaine, the doughnut hole is going to be closed over a period of time. We're beginning to close it by \$250 straight away. We've made Medicare stronger and better. How did we do that? By making sure that you have preventative services at no additional copay and no deductible. So this is coming your way.

It's a new American freedom, a new day in America, when no longer will any family have the fear of going broke and losing their home just because of an accident or just because someone gets sick.

But we didn't just act for Elaine and every other family in America to guarantee them access to health care; we lowered their taxes. Now, the quote here says, "Tax bills in 2009 at lowest

level since 1950," from USA Today. We've lowered taxes for the people who need it the most, the middle class. This is not my point of view, this is the point of view of the former domestic policy adviser to President Reagan and Treasury Department economist to President George Herbert Walker Bush. This was a statement that he made, Mr. Bruce Bartlett. Federal taxes are very considerably lower by every measure since Obama became President. The \$787 billion stimulus bill, enacted with no Republican support, reduced Federal taxes by almost \$100 billion in 2009 and \$222 billion in 2010.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me, if you might yield for a moment, Dr. KAGEN. The stimulus bill was actually a tax cut bill?

Mr. KAGEN. It was the biggest tax cut in American history. We were in such a decline economically, no one felt it. We did it the economical way. We didn't mail people a check. We made sure they got the tax cut on the other end. It was more economical. So never before has such a tax cut been enacted. And it was the Democrats, without the Republicans' support, that guaranteed middle class families would pay less in taxes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might, you and I were talking earlier about a program that you have been doing in your district for the last couple of weeks, and you have been going to communities. And along the way you've reached out and said we need to make it in America. And you were talking about the paper industry. I suppose you have a paper industry in your district?

Mr. KAGEN. I live in Paper Valley. We didn't invent the manufacturing of paper, but we perfected the science and technology. Kimberly-Clark, you have heard of it. You have heard of Kleenex. Let me put in a plug for them. We've got Procter & Gamble. We've got Puffs. Everything in the tissue world and the paper world is in Appleton and Green Bay and the chain of Fox Cities in-between.

And one of those manufacturers, Appleton Coated Paper, tomorrow has a case before the International Trade Commission. And I brought with me a picture of a family. This is the Swanningson family. This is Tony, his wife Sherry, Corey, and Kayla. And they live in Kaukauna on highway ZZ. What are they doing? Well, he works at Appleton Coated Paper. And they have a problem because China has been competing illegally by dumping their paper products into our domestic United States marketplace below our cost of production.

Now, I know you're thinking how does that happen? But before I get there, let me read you the handwritten note that Mr. Swanningson sent to me. "Congressman Steve Kagen, I have been employed in the paper industry for 18 years. I am grateful for the ability to provide for my family that the industry has provided. The dumping of foreign paper into the United States

from companies that are subsidized by their own governments creates a marketplace that seriously threatens my family and countless other families throughout the United States. The ability to sell paper at a price that is less than the cost to produce it places our companies and families at a severe disadvantage. I have been able to maintain employment through four layoffs due to the mill sales and paper machine shutdowns. But the dumping of paper in the United States market is a challenge that me and my fellow union brothers and sisters throughout the United States cannot survive."

You see, what China's been doing—and I have a case against China. They didn't just manipulate their currency, they don't have any environmental protection. They don't have a social safety net. They don't have an Occupational Safety and Health Administration. They don't have OSHA. They don't have an EPA. They have sacrificed their environment for their economic development. And they don't yet have a middle class.

Now, I have nothing against another Nation seeking to lift its people up out of poverty and create a middle class. But they shouldn't do it at our expense. We shouldn't have to sacrifice our middle class solely to build up theirs. It's unfair.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield on that point, one of the issues we've talked about today and have been for a long time is the issue of Chinese currency manipulation by the Chinese Government. And we do not have to have growth in the United States at the expense of growth in China. If the Chinese would allow their currency to float, it would actually be worth more. So the Chinese consumer would be able to have more buying power for American goods that would be shipped over there, for other companies who are selling within China.

There is just a small group of people within China, who own primarily state-owned businesses, who like the currency low, artificially reduced so that they can ship products to the United States cheaper and subsidized to put American workers out of business. So what we're saying when we say make it in America and manufacture again, can actually help lift up a lot of these folks in countries like China if we play by the rules.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Be happy to yield.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me for a moment, gentlemen, but part of our agenda as Democrats then is to make sure that we have fair trade, that we have a fair balance between our Nation, our manufacturers, and those in other countries who may be—not may be, but are—subsidizing their exports, such as China and the currency thing.

Dr. KAGEN? And this is a colloquy, so we will go back and forth here. So please.

Mr. KAGEN. I am getting a little excited because China has been caught

cheating. They don't just manipulate their currency. They provide free energy, they provide no taxation, they provide cheap labor at 82 cents an hour. They have been buying raw materials for nothing, giving it to a company, and then they load it up on a boat and float it outside of Oakland and dump it into our Nation, into our domestic market below our cost of production.

□ 1750

Let me just put it very succinctly. They have targeted everything we make for extinction. It's not just paper. It's high-tech technology; it's automobiles; it's steel; it's textiles.

We have to restore our manufacturing base, yes, in part, by compelling other nations to stop cheating, by not manipulating their currency, by playing fair. One way to play fair is to instead of stealing our jobs, why don't you take our values. Take our values about clean air and clean water, because they are polluting the air that we are breathing.

It's not that far away. If a tall man and an allergist—and I say this—if a tall man in China sneezes, you are going to get it in the back of your head. It's going to come over here.

We have studies that scientifically show that the great dust storm they had in China dropped that dust over on our west coast. We are all here in the same boat. So, yes, we have to push back, not just for fair trade, but for balanced trade, in order for our companies to compete.

I will just relate one story, one educational experience in, I believe it was in February of 2007, just after I was sent here. I had the opportunity with my class of 2006 to sit down with eight CEOs of major manufacturing companies, the high-tech companies, HP, IBM, Dell and the like.

I asked them, what's your biggest component of your overhead, and each one of them said people, people, people, people. I said, well, that would explain why you are taking our jobs over to India and China because you can hire them for less.

And right across from me was Michael Dell and he said, Congressman KAGEN, I am competing with these guys. I have to chase the lowest cost of production around the world or I am out of business, and I have to, after all, represent my people, which are my stockholders.

So we have to make things in America. Manufacturing does matter, but we need a level playing field.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's continue on. I notice that another colleague has joined us from the great State of New York, but let me turn back to our colleague that was raising the point about the Chinese currency.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes. Well, I would say that if it's balanced, and I think all of the workers and the business people in America would say this, if China is not manipulating their currency, if there was some balance with human

rights and worker rights and the environment and those kinds of things, we would compete with anybody. But what we have now under the current trading system, with China blatantly manipulating our currency, we had almost everybody at this hearing today acknowledging that China is cheating on their currency, Democrats and Republicans. But we had a lot of Republicans on the other side saying, we just don't think this is the approach.

And it gets back to these multinational corporations that have a stranglehold on a lot of the politics going on here in the United States capital. But we need to bring this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, and we need to pass it, and we need to take on the Chinese.

We are not going to have a country left in a decade or so if we are not making things. You get the spinoff. You get the technology. You get the patents. You get five, six, seven, eight spinoff jobs for every one job. You are actually making something and moving it to you and you improve it and add value and you pass it along and add value. And then it's assembled; then it's trucked. There is the spinoff that we get with manufacturing. That's how we are going to resuscitate the middle class.

My fear is that as we have lost manufacturing, and if you chart it—you can see it decline from 39 percent in post-World War II down to under 10 percent—you could see the decline. My fear is that as we move into the development of solar panels, as we move into the development of windmills, that's exactly it.

As we develop the green technology and all of the component parts, you will begin to see China taking the lead on green manufacturing, and we can't see that ground because that is the future. As much as our friends on the other side of the aisle want to bury their head in the sand and hope this goes away, that's not the world we live in.

So we need to take a firm approach with China, respect them, but make sure they play by the rules. We have got to play by the rules. Everyone else has got to play by the rules.

I will use one example real briefly. We had a steel company, Oil Country Tubular Products for oil and gas. The steelworkers, the trade groups, the local businesses, all went around, petitioned the International Trade Commission, got approval. The President was kind enough to put on a tariff for these Oil Country Tubular goods coming in. They end up investing \$650 million in a factory in Youngstown, Ohio, 400 construction jobs, 350 permanent jobs, the spinoff, the whole 9 yards because our government enforced the rules and leveled the playing field. That's what we are saying about currency, tires, paper, textiles, right down the line.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me take a moment here and bring it back to some-

thing you were talking about. You mentioned the wind turbines and the solar systems. We developed the technology here in the United States, and, in fact, the stimulus bill that provided the largest increase ever in research is going to once again put the United States in a position where we can dominate these green industries.

That research is there. Incidentally, not one Republican voted for that enormous research program and tax cut and jobs program and infrastructure program. Not one Republican voted for the program that created 3 million jobs.

But there is something going on here that we need to pay attention to, and this is a piece of legislation that I have introduced. We are spending billions of dollars to promote the wind industry, the solar industry. These are tax credits that we give to companies for a production tax credit or for someone that's putting a solar cell on their house.

We need to make sure that that tax money is spent on American-made wind turbines and American-made solar panels, biofuels, and other kinds of green technologies. If it's our tax money, then Buy America. Buy American.

A little later here, I suspect, I want one of our colleagues, MARCY KAPTUR, to come and talk to us about a bill that passed out of this House just hours ago that would require that you and I, not just talk the talk, but that we walk the walk and that in the equipment that we purchase for our offices, it be made in America, once again, American tax money used to buy American-made products.

It's a piece of legislation I have introduced. I like it. I like it because it's going to create in my industry wind turbines that are actually going to not only be on the hills but actually made in America.

Enough for me for a few minutes. I notice my colleague from New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO, has joined us. You have been at this a long time. You were in one of the original manufacturing sectors of America. Please tell us.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for bringing us together. You are right, I do represent the area that houses the Erie Canal bed that was the main route to the westward movement, and it's a necklace of communities called mill towns that were the centers of invention and innovation. That pioneer spirit still exists, I am convinced, in America.

During our recent work-period break, where we all went back to our districts and had a 6-week stretch to connect to our constituents, I did Tuesday tours. The Tuesday tours were about manufacturing, making it in America, and where we need to invest and where the success stories might rest.

It's amazing to see the stories that were impacted by the Recovery Act, work done by water efficiency, energy efficiency, the MEP program, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership,

which, by the way, the previous administration wanted to zero out.

I went to a group called X-Ray Opticals. Because of MEP programming and SBIR, Small Business Innovation Research, monies, this group is employing people they never dropped during the recession. They were a steady pulse, and they are exporting.

Just when we want to say we are not exporting and, oh, the die is cast and, oh, woe is us, we lost our manufacturing sector, we lost a third of our manufacturing jobs over the last decade thanks to the weakened policy on manufacturing. But we still have enough jobs that places us on the top of that manufacturing list globally, but we can't afford that present trend which would see us losing more manufacturing jobs.

We have turned that around. Those one-third of manufacturing jobs lost in the last decade equates to 4.6 million jobs lost.

But now, with the Recovery Act, with a new focus on manufacturing, I think there is a stronger sense that we can move forward and proclaim accurately that we want to make it in America.

Representative GARAMENDI, let me just tell you that at X-Ray Opticals they are exporting to Asia and to Europe. They are dealing with testing for toxins. They manufacture equipment that is the testing product for toxins in toys, in fuel and a number of items where they can save manufacturers in another realm a lot of money in the up-front part of their process.

□ 1800

And again, it's a high-tech operation where they had the investment and the partnership with the Federal Government so that we can do it smarter, not necessarily cheaper. We can do it smarter, and then we are competitive at the global marketplace.

Another venture was a state-of-the-art operation within the baby food industry. In my district, we have a new facility that qualifies for a silver status LEED building, a green building that has water efficiency and energy efficiency as a major aspect of the work they are doing, saving them cost of production and allowing them to stretch again that opportunity to translate it into jobs. Now, that was a government partnership to provide for water and energy efficiency, another sort of assistance we can provide manufacturing.

And then a third visit, if I might just share this one with you, was an outcome of the ARPA-E grant money that came with Recovery Act money. Now, get a load of this. Before I came to Congress, there was an opportunity for us to really do the ARPA-E program beyond just rhetoric, but the Bush Presidency just proclaimed we are going to have an ARPA-E program with never ever funding it. And finally, we had \$800 million appear from the Recovery Act that went to the actual implementation of ARPA-E.

DARPA, the Defense-related advanced research project opportunities, created situations like Internet for the Defense system and stealth bombers. We took that success that goes back to the NASA days and now overlaid that into the energy thinking, into the energy realm.

And so ARPA-E, with its research project initiatives, is enabling this industry, SuperPower in Schenectady, another tour location, to advance superconductive cable and also storage for intermittent power.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Before you go to the next one, could you share with us where the ARPA-E money came into the system?

Mr. TONKO. Sure. It came right from the Recovery Act.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Most people don't know what the Recovery Act is. They think of the stimulus program. They are one and the same, the stimulus program and the Recovery Act.

Mr. TONKO. It is exactly the same thing. The majority in this House supported the Recovery Act.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is, the Democrats supported and passed the stimulus program, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Mr. TONKO. Our friends on the other side of the aisle said "no" to progress.

Mr. GARAMENDI. "No." "No." "No."

So for research-specific programs, for energy research and small businesses, they got grants and loans to develop. The Democrats know that we have to improve the private sector to make jobs.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Well, let me tell you, Representative GARAMENDI, what this means is that with that recovery money, with the stimulus money that the Democrats support and the Republicans said "no" to, we were able to, for once now, finally, appropriate moneys for the science, the technology, and the basic research.

What they will do at SuperPower is develop that final model that will then be deployed into a manufacturing concept that will allow us to create the storage potential for exactly what you were talking about, solar energy and wind energy, which is intermittent in nature. If we get the storage issue, the battery issue resolved, it becomes even more powerful.

So it's not just about taking a garage idea and creating a manufactured product out of it, but it's also creating jobs, which then enables us to create better energy solutions.

So all of this, in a big picture format, is a whiz-kid idea where everybody from tradesmen to Ph.D.'s all get their hands in the action, where we develop a product line which requires manufacturing jobs, but then that product will enable us to respond more favorably and fully to the energy solutions that we can do here domestically and be more energy self-efficient and energy independent. It all comes together in a

master plan that uses the American workers' intellect from skilled labor on over to the Ph.D. And it all happens with our saying "yes" to a partnership like that of the stimulus package.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, we know that the central New York area along the Erie Canal was one of the birthplaces of the American Industrial Revolution. I think there was something in the Midwest, too. My colleagues here from the Midwest may have something to add to it. Ohio, I believe? Do you still make things in Ohio?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes, we do. And we are right in line to continue down the road of innovation, whether it was aerospace with the Wright brothers, the steel industry in Youngstown in the eastern part of my district, or the rubber industry in Akron, which is the western part of my district that I share with Representative SUTTON. And we had, in Youngstown at one point, the highest per capita income in the country in the late fifties, early sixties. Steelworkers were working hard, long hours, making good money, good wages, raising their families, having a good middle class. The big bands would come through town. They would go to Idora Park. The story of America that we all remember.

And today, what we are saying is we understand that it's not going to be 1950, and Frank Sinatra is not going to come back and start singing songs again, as much as that would be terrific. We have got to create our own era of prosperity, and that means that in this country we have got to get tough with globalization and enforcing trade laws. And that means as a country we've got to suck it up, and we've got to say to the multinational corporations, who, quite frankly, don't have the national interest at heart—they've got their bottom line at heart, which is what they do. But as a country, we've got the national interest and need to protect the national interest. So tough with China. Level the playing field. Drive investment back into the United States so that we can make that bus, those solar panels, those windmills and the batteries, right down the line.

And we are not foolish enough. This isn't Pollyanna. We're not going to make everything. We know there is going to be stuff that's manufactured in China for the Chinese markets. Great. And I hope American companies go over there and do that. But what we are saying is we can't be weak-kneed with the Chinese.

I like what I saw today at the hearing we had. I like what I'm hearing within our caucus to possibly bring a bill to the floor that would get tough with China and get us making things in America again.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You said something a moment ago when you were talking about the multinational corporations and whether we're willing to stand up to the multinational corporations and bring jobs back to America. Two and a half weeks ago, we came

back from our session working out in our districts to pick up a piece of legislation called the Education Jobs and Medical Assistance Act. As a result of that, 160,000 teachers are employed across the Nation, and police and firemen, public safety officials and medical services are being provided in the communities.

A major piece of that legislation dealt precisely with the issue you discussed a moment ago about multinationals. Under the previous law, multinational companies that took jobs from America and shipped them to China or somewhere else in the world actually got a tax break. We closed that loophole. We closed that tax loophole, bringing \$10 billion back to the Treasury and discouraging American corporations, ending their incentive.

Mr. TONKO, if you would like to jump into this one.

Mr. TONKO. I think not only is that true, but also I believe during the Bush Presidency there was a strong focus on a portion of our economy, on our jobs, and somewhat a weak commitment to other sectors. As we all know, when you break down the jobs or the economy issue, it's agriculture, it's manufacturing, and it's service sector. I think the emphasis on agriculture and manufacturing was extremely weak.

We see the problems in the agricultural community. I see them in my dairy sector in my district. It's painful to see the lack of attention that has been paid to a fair price for dairy farmers.

In manufacturing, it was ignored heavily. They wanted to, as I said, zero out MEP, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which produced a lot of success for X-Ray Opticals, where now they are exporting. But they put all their emphasis in the service sector, and where they did, they turned their back to regulation, to overview, to kind of stewardship of a sector of the economy that, when left to control itself, brought down, because of greed, the American economy, and it wreaked damage upon us.

So what I would say is that we need to put the focus back into manufacturing. The programs we have done here, after the damage that was allowed to occur, are now going to bring back a strong response to manufacturing. And I can't say well enough how strong the Democratic agenda has been here to grow the Make it in America campaign.

Make it in America is something that people have been asking for. And they can't understand, why is it our manufacturing can't work here? Well, we see where the intellect is being invested in, where we are growing a strong partnership with small business, the springboard to our economy. They are providing the great percentage of new jobs in our society.

So, finally, the Democrats bring a working agenda that will be a profitable situation for all of us with job creation and the kind of stability and

local infusion that is essential after it was ignored for far too long.

□ 1810

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's turn to our colleague from the manufacturing center of America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You want to talk about an example, the illustration of what Democrats stand for when it comes to manufacturing, come to my district. Last week we unveiled the rollout of a third shift at the General Motors plant that is making the Cruise car, a hot car being sold by General Motors all over the world. Think about what would have happened with manufacturing in the United States if this President and this House and this Senate said, Let the auto industry go. I remember watching TV programs and hearing Senators and Republicans from the other side of the aisle saying let the free market work. Let it crash.

We would have lost an essential component to manufacturing in the United States. We would have lost General Motors for sure, sold off in pieces, and who knows who would have come in and ate up that market share from somewhere else in the world. But we said, no. We need to have manufacturing. We need to be a leader in the auto industry. This is something we believe in, and we are now seeing manufacturing increase month after month after month because of the stimulus package and because of what the President and this Democratic Congress did for the auto industry.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman agree that if you don't make anything, you won't have anything?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That makes sense to me.

Mr. KAGEN. You have to make things to have things. And it is manufacturing that brings us our higher wage jobs. But when we brought the bill you referred to to the House floor, only 12 Republicans voted to close the very corporate tax loopholes that ship our jobs overseas. We cannot continue to reward corporations for stealing our jobs and taking them overseas. Whose side are we on? You have to be on the side of the middle class.

When it came time to consider, as we are now in discussions, to making permanent tax cuts for the middle class, it is the Democratic Party that stands up for the middle class to make it possible for them to have a permanent tax cut. The other side of the aisle is promoting what? More and more debt to reward the top 1 or 2 percent income earners in the United States. That is just not right. It is not right for our cities in Wisconsin, and it is not right for America.

The other aspect: The other side of the aisle has an idea about Social Security, to phase it out. Phase out Social Security?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Wait, you mean to tell me that the Republican Party actually has, as one of their policy planks, to phase out Social Security?

Mr. KAGEN. In the State of Wisconsin, it is in their party platform to transform and phase out Social Security. But Social Security is a sacred contract between one generation and the next. It is the most successful social program ever invented by human beings. It guarantees people will be in their house, not the poorhouse, when they become old. It is not a retirement plan, but it is something if you put your money in, you did the work, you have got to be able to get your money out. So when it comes to Social Security, we are here to protect it and enhance it. Our opposition seeks to destroy it. There should be no question about whose side we are on.

But getting back to making it in America, making it in America is not only about manufacturing, it is about guaranteeing that your children have, that the Swannington family's children, Corey and Kayla, have a great education. It is about guaranteeing that you have access to affordable health care when and where you need it. It is about guaranteeing that our manufacturing base that creates the higher-wage jobs can compete on a level playing field. This is something that just makes sense. But around here, if it makes sense, it is going to be hard to do.

So I would join with my colleagues in encouraging your bill to move forward, to make certain that this administration and any administration moving forward holds China accountable to stop manipulating its currency.

Now, the big picture that I get to see at 30,000 feet that I didn't see before coming here—and you know I am a doctor, right? I always tell my patients, you know, it is going to take you just about as long to get better as it took you to get sick. It took us a while to slide into this deep recession, and it is going to take a while to work our way back into prosperity. But making it—we are going to make it in America, not just with manufacturing once again, but by making sure that we hold China and other Asian nations accountable.

So what I see happening is the idea that free market capitalism has bumped into a brick wall, the Chinese wall. It is the Asian model of capitalism where the government owns the corporation, controls the currency, offers slave-like wages for labor, environmental conditions at work that we would not tolerate, not even for our animals. So what we have to ship overseas is not our jobs, but our American values. That is who we are. The voters will have a chance in several weeks to make decisions about whose side we are on. When it comes to tax cuts for the middle class and to protecting Social Security and making things in America, when it comes to closing those tax loopholes, the Democrats are on their side.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have talked about various ways we can make it in America, certainly the fair trade dealing with China's currency and the

whole idea of competition. We have talked about the way in which we have to make sure that our tax laws support programs of hiring in the United States rather than off-shoring. In all of these things I would hope our Republican colleagues would come along with us to make it in America. But on maybe 20 different bills that we have moved out of this House, there has been virtually no Republican support.

There are other opportunities, and we offer these opportunities to our Republican colleagues to come along with us on some other programs. A piece of legislation that I am working on deals with these buses that were once made in the Midwest, in Ohio, and are still made in California. Right now we spend about \$6 billion of our gasoline tax money to buy buses, light rail trains, intercity rail systems for Amtrak and the like. In the law, there are four waivers that allow the Department of Transportation to ignore the Buy American rules, and so what has happened over the last 20 years or so is that those waivers are routinely used and transit districts simply buy buses that are made overseas. Our tax money flows out of the country, our jobs disappear, and our industry, the transportation industry, is almost gone.

My legislation tells the Department of Transportation, no, no, those waivers are finished. Three of the four waivers are gone. If there is an extraordinary cost difference, okay. But we want that money spent on American jobs so that when in the San Francisco Bay area, the Bay Area Rapid Transit system, BART, goes out, as they will, to buy \$300 million of train sets for the BART system, where will those trains be made? Will they be made in China? Given the monetary advantage that China has, quite possibly they could win the bid. Given the issues of worker safety and environmental issues that China ignores, they may win the bid. But my legislation says no, we are going to make these trains in America, \$300 million there, \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year across the Nation for transit districts everywhere, we can make it in America if we bring our tax money back. So whether it is wind turbines or solar or buses and trains, it is our tax money. Let's spend it in America, rebuild the American manufacturing system, and make it in America.

Would that be a good thing for Ohio?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are all for it, and I tell you what, if you think about the contrast of the Bush doctrine, which Republicans currently want to go back to, and I am amazed around election time when they are pretty blatant about saying, yup, that is exactly what we want to do. We want to go back to the Bush doctrine on taxes and on energy and all of this, and the economy and not regulating Wall Street, they want to go back to the Bush doctrine of economic policy.

Now I understand that we are having this tax debate now because the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and

everyone are going to expire. We need to remember that these were the tax cuts that were going to unleash the economy in the United States. We were going to have all of this growth because of the Bush tax cuts. Cut taxes for the wealthy, explosion among developers, explosion among the economy, and we're going to have low unemployment and everything else. And where did it end? The absolute collapse of the United States economy.

□ 1820

What we're saying is not only tax cuts for the wealthiest in the country but tax cuts to offshore work, incentives for businesses to offshore work out of the country. So it's tax cuts for the wealthiest, offshoring work, having a prescription drug plan that you don't even pay for, borrowing money from the Chinese to run two wars, okay? So this is all the Bush Doctrine which would privatize Social Security and Medicare. This is all the Bush Doctrine.

What we're saying is don't privatize Social Security and Medicare. Let's invest back into these programs. Let's give tax cuts to the middle class. Let's give tax cuts to businesses which will locate and create jobs in the United States. Let's get a manufacturing policy in the United States so that we can have an auto industry, a steel industry, a paper industry, a textile industry, and most importantly, engineering, design and manufacturing economies of the future in green—a clear contrast between the Bush policies that our Republican friends clearly still trumpet and want to go back to. You have on that chart there what we have done to reverse that trend and to continue to invest back into America so we can make things again.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You talked about the investment.

A week ago, President Obama spoke to this issue of making it in America and of rebuilding the American industries. He spoke about the need to give significant tax breaks to businesses that want to invest capital to expand their businesses, to expand their manufacturing bases. Here is a very, very powerful notion.

I was meeting with three of my friends who are in the business community. They are manufacturers—one in the food industry, another in the high-tech industry. I was talking to them about this notion of would you increase your business, would you increase your capital investment on your production lines if you could write off in 1 year the cost of that capital. They said, Absolutely. You put that into law, and I'm investing tomorrow. I'm going to put people to work building my manufacturing base.

So the President has now spoken to this. It's one of the proposals that he has put forward. Today, I introduced a piece of legislation that would do exactly that. Any business that wants to increase its capital investment in that

business—broadband, production lines, machine tools, whatever it is—they could write it off in year one. We can restart the American manufacturing system if we are committed to making it in America, which is a whole series of legislation: ending tax breaks for offshoring, ending tax breaks for businesses that are routinely killing the American economy by sending jobs offshore, using our tax money to build a green economy here in America rather than buying it from manufacturers overseas, making sure our buses, our trains, our planes are made in America.

Dr. KAGEN, you've been in the high-tech industry, in the medical industry. You understand these issues.

Mr. KAGEN. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It affects your kinds of businesses. Share with us your perspective as we begin to wrap this up in the next 6 minutes.

Mr. KAGEN. Well, I'll make a brief comment.

The investment tax credit is so critical for emerging pharmaceutical companies—for biotechnology in particular. So when you reward people for doing good work instead of rewarding corporations and people for their wealth, you really begin to get that engine of America going, that small-business engine that really creates all the jobs that we need. I would summarize what Mr. RYAN had to say as this:

The Bush Doctrine, the Reagan Doctrine of trickle-down economics has failed miserably. It has rewarded people for their wealth instead of their work.

What we must begin to do again is to encourage people, in small business in particular and small banks, to take that risk, to take that chance and to reward you for your risk-taking and for your hard work. That will start the economic engine, and it will rebuild our economy as we go through this transformation over the next decade of becoming energy independent. We may not be totally independent as a Nation as far as growing our own energy, as far as developing our own energy, but we certainly have the resources here at home. Making it in America means not just manufacturing, making things here; it also means investing our hard-earned tax dollars in our own Nation's infrastructure.

What I object to so greatly is that we take our resources, like our children, and send them off to Iraq and Afghanistan, and we send \$2 billion a week into Afghanistan, rebuilding buildings we've never destroyed and building schools that they may need, but we need schools as well and water treatment plants. Look, if we're going to build an infrastructure, it should be here in these United States. That is where my people live. I don't represent people overseas.

Finally, with manufacturing, invest in infrastructure. We also need to balance our trade deals, about which you and I have had discussions with the Asian nations, to make sure that our

trade is balanced. That way, we can generate the higher waged jobs that we need here at home—jobs that will keep people in their homes, that will feed our tax base, that will rebuild our schools, and rebuild our middle class.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Dr. KAGEN, thank you so very much for joining us.

As I started this discussion, I used an analogy of a football game. We're talking about the most important game of all. It's not even a game. The most important thing of all is the American economy and how to keep it going and growing.

To go back over it, during the Bush years, these are all of the reasons we've stated: Two wars for which money was borrowed, creating an enormous deficit; the deregulation of Wall Street, anything goes; the collapse of Wall Street; the issues of tax policy where the wealthy were rewarded for their wealth, not for their work, which led to the largest decline in the American economy since the Great Depression of the 1930s.

It was plain to see that when President Obama came in. That was the first quarter. In the second quarter, we began to see policies that were put forth by the Democratic Party and the Democratic administration, policies that began to restore the American economy—a steady upward climb. It's not where we need to be, but we are on the road, and we did all of that with almost no Republican help at all. If you go back through all of those votes, the Republican Party was standing over there, saying no, no to the programs that actually brought us back, and we continue on today. We are in the locker room, ready for the second half, which begins in January 2011. The question is:

Which team are you going to put back on the field? Where do you stand?

Well, we know pretty clearly where the Republican Party stands. It stands with the old failed policies of the George W. Bush administration. It stands for ending Social Security and for ending Medicare. It stands for anything goes and no regulation; let it rip and it's ripped us off. It stands for tax breaks for the wealthy and the heck with the middle class. That's where the Republican Party stands.

The Democratic Party wants to make it in America, to rebuild the American manufacturing base and the American manufacturing industry.

If you would, Dr. KAGEN, put the picture back up of the family, of the family in your district in the paper industry. This family is losing its job because of unfair competition. If we were to use the Capital Investment Program together with the program that you talked about of restoring fairness and trade, perhaps that company, that family and families in my district would be able to have well-paid, middle class American jobs.

Dr. KAGEN, would you like to close us off here and bring us back to real America.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you very much for yielding.

I'll just summarize that the Swanningson family wants nothing more than any other family in the United States. They want an opportunity to go to work where it's safe, where they can earn a living wage, where they can begin to pay off their own debts and make it on their own, to have their own home, to have a living wage sufficient enough to educate themselves and the next generation—their children. That is, after all, what every family wants.

This is the American Dream that is being stolen away by the illegal dumping of paper into our area, and when China has targeted everything else we make for extinction, it's just time that we stand up and fight for our own jobs here at home. We're going to make it in America when we all begin to paddle in the same direction, when we're all in the same boat. So let's get on board. Let's take that train ride together.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Dr. KAGEN, thank you so very much and my colleagues for joining us, and thank you to my colleagues in the Democratic Party, who are committed to manufacturing matters and to making it in America. We have put forth many, many policies and programs. We ask our Republican colleagues to join us in making it in America.

I yield back my time, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1830

THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Good evening. It's a pleasure to be able to join you. I had a chance to listen in on some of the last hour presented by the Democrats and their views on the economy. It seemed like a fair amount of sophistry to me and a lot of excuses. It would seem like we're blaming things on Bush and the Chinese. So I am going to be presenting and maybe even have some guests here presenting a different perspective on the economy, and the American people will be the judge of that debate and discussion in November.

Now I would suggest that the Democrats and their policies are actually destructive to the economy. I don't think it's a coincidence that if you look at the 10 cities in America that have the highest percentage of people below the poverty level, that those cities have been managed, every one of them, for many years by Democrats. Now you can blame the Chinese and you can blame President Bush, but I would suggest, and I will show in the next hour in plain, simple terms why the Democrat policies are literally destroying the economy.

Now you could say, well, I don't like that, or maybe you're being partisan.

I'm not really quite so concerned about being partisan or whether we like things politically. I'm concerned with America. I'm concerned with the people that don't have jobs. And I'm concerned that not only are we creating unemployment but we are systematically destroying the businesses that can create employment in the future.

Let's take a look at these questions. Those are strong charges to say that the Democrats are the ones that are actually responsible for what's been going on. I think a lot of Americans have some sense that that may be true. Sometimes it's fun to take a look at some of these political cartoons. We have the President here now talking to the guy that owns the china shop: "Now give me one good reason why you're not hiring." And you have health care reform storming in and cap-and-tax or cap-and-trade and the taxes that are impending and all. The point of the cartoon, of course, is the fact that the policies that we have seen are creating the unemployment.

Let's look at that again just a little bit closer. Now when we talk about the economy, there are different ways of measuring it, you can see. Well, is Wall Street doing well? Am I doing well? Am I happy with my job or are things going comfortably for me? Is there a lot of employment or unemployment? Those are measures that we use. We take a look, also, at the rate of the Federal Government, how much it's spending money versus how much it's having to borrow. Those are all things when we say the economy, what does that mean? But particularly it's very personal when we talk about unemployment and it becomes not a political issue but a personal issue when it's your job that was just lost.

We were told that we had to come up with this economic stimulus bill last year. We were told that if you don't pass this economic stimulus bill, this unemployment could get above where it is now. It's going up, could get above, but if you don't pass it, why, we could have 9 percent unemployment if you don't pass this stimulus bill. And so the Democrats, all by themselves, passed this \$800 billion bill to supposedly stimulate the economy. After they passed it, what happened? Well, now we've got this unemployment here at 9.7 percent. The numbers vary, but we're pretty close to 10. But that 10 percent is very conservative, because if you've lost your job more than a year ago, you don't get to count in the statistics anymore. So, in fact, the unemployment rate is well over 10 percent in America.

Now we were told that if you passed the stimulus bill, that we could keep it underneath 8 percent. That's the words that the Democrats brought to this floor a year ago. The fact is they were wrong. Anybody can see they're wrong. Just take a look at what the unemployment numbers are, and they don't bear it out. In fact, they spent \$800 billion, and where did it all go? Did it go

for a lot of projects? Or was it just more bailouts? In fact, it turned out that it had a lot of bailout money in it that didn't really go for even things that FDR would have considered an economic stimulus package.

This is what's going on. We've got a high level of unemployment. The stimulus package that was passed here, and the Democrats said the Republicans didn't help any. They're right, they didn't, because we didn't think that stimulus package would work. We stood here on the floor, I stood here on the floor on a time just like this, on a Wednesday night, and said, "It's not going to work." But they did it, anyway; and now we can see, it didn't work.

And now what are they going to do? Well, they want to do some more stimulus packages. Is it going to work? No. Because it's based on faulty economics. It will never work. The interesting thing is they should have really listened to the Secretary of the Treasury under FDR, Henry Morgenthau. He tried the same thing. This was back in the 1930s. He said, we've tried spending money to try and get the economy going. We've spent and spent. Now we're in a tremendous amount of debt and unemployment hasn't changed a bit. He said, "It does not work." To this House Ways and Means Committee, Henry Morgenthau, way before I was born, he was saying, "It doesn't work." Yet here we go; we're doing it again.

Now let's take a look more specifically at what the Democrat policies are that are in conflict with creating jobs, because I would suggest that the Democrats have got this problem. The problem is, is that everything they stand for is specifically going to be in conflict with creating jobs.

What are the things they stand for? Well, let's take a look at where jobs come from. And this is the linkage that the Democrat Party doesn't want you to figure out. It's not a very complicated thing. And, that is, if you get a job, you have to get a job from somebody. Who's the "from somebody"? Well, it's a business somewhere. You can't separate employers and people who run businesses from jobs. Jobs just don't hang out there floating around somewhere. They're created by an employer somewhere. And if you create conditions economically that make it impossible for the employers, then guess what's going to happen. You're not going to have jobs. It's not very complicated. It's about as simple as a lemonade stand. I'm going to use the illustration of a lemonade stand to try and hammer through this very simple truth; and it's very important, because the future, the economic future, the future of families in America hang on understanding these simple principles.

The idea is that jobs come from an employer; and if you harm the employer, you're not going to have the jobs. And if you do it bad enough as

FDR did and you hammer them bad enough, you'll put the employers out of business, and then it's going to be a long time before the company starts up and new jobs can be created. So let's take a look at what happens.

Let's say that you've got a lemonade stand. You happen to have a very fortunate piece of property and a whole lot of people are coming through there. They're hot, sweaty and tired. You've got the one piece of property where you can put up a whole of a lemonade stand. So you start out. You hire your younger brother and sister to work there. You squeeze the lemon juice in the morning and get some sugar from the store, put it all together, you get some ice, get out there and you have a pretty good day. You sell a lot of lemonade, you get going at it, and pretty soon, though, you realize there's a whole lot more demand for your lemonade than you have capacity to make this stuff.

So you start thinking, man, I wonder if I should go down and buy some sort of a lemon squeezer and a great big shaker machine and ice machine. I'll hire five or six more people, not just my younger brother and sister but I'm going to bring some other friends from my class and they can all work at the lemonade stand and we'll make a whole lot more lemonade then, you think to yourself. But for me to buy that ice machine and the lemon squeezer and all, I'm going to have to have some money and I'm going to have to make sure that there's going to be enough money coming in from lemonade to pay off the cost of that machinery.

So if you're an owner of a business, one of the things you have to figure out is you have to have enough money to be able to create new jobs. Now if you go with your plan and you buy the lemon squeezer and the ice machine, you can hire eight more people to make lemonade and you can sell it.

□ 1840

But it requires that you've got to have some money to buy the ice machine and the lemon squeezer. You've been making good money in the lemonade stand, you can see how you could pay it off in a couple of months, but you don't have the money right now. And so as a businessman you're saying, well, I've somehow got to get this money, and that comes into a question about liquidity, if you can borrow some money from somebody.

Now, what happens to this lemonade stand guy if you're running along, you're making this lemonade, and all of a sudden you say we're going to put a tax on lemonade stands and we're going to charge 50 cents a glass of tax on lemonade? Well, if you do that, that means the guy that owns the lemonade stand isn't going to have the money to pay off the ice machine and the lemon squeezer, so he's going to just hunker down. He will pay the tax, he will keep things going the way they are, but he says, man, this is a hostile environ-

ment out here. They're taxing every glass of lemonade I make, and so I'm not going to create as many jobs.

Now I guess a lemonade stand may be silly, I'm trying to make it sound simple. It's not complicated. If you tax the owners of businesses heavily they're not going to have the money to make the investments to create new jobs, and it's that linkage which the Democrats refuse to understand and it is so obvious and so simple. Our policies are going after the owners of businesses and we're calling them "rich guys" and we're saying you've got to punish the rich guys by taking their money so everybody else can be okay. This is the bailout mindset. This is the bailout fever that has infected this city. It is the bailout concept that the government has to redistribute wealth. And when you take it away from the guys that own the business, you're not going to be creating the jobs.

That's just the mechanics of how economics works. You don't have to like it. I didn't invent it, I'm just explaining what is common sense and most Americans can understand: Jobs come from employers; if you destroy employers, you're not going to have jobs. And how do you destroy employers? The best way to do it? Tax them. There are other ways to destroy businesses, but taxing them is a pretty good way to do it.

Let's take a look at other questions. One, like the lemonade stand example, if the owner of the business, maybe he's making good profit on his lemonade but he doesn't have a huge bank account or money saved up. What he will want to do is go to a bank and borrow some money for his ice machine and his lemon squeezer. So he goes to the bank and he tries to get a loan from the bank, but what we found is going on right now, the policies on banks are so tight—even though the Fed has released tons of money—that the bankers are afraid to loan money to businesses and businesses are afraid to borrow it. That is not a good condition if you're trying to create jobs because you have to have a source of money for businessmen to borrow in order to get innovation and things going to get the marketplace going.

Another thing that's a huge killer of jobs is if the businessman doesn't know what's going to happen. The guy with the lemonade stand is doing a land office business because it's 100 degrees every day and everybody is coming by his lemonade stand. But the thing is he knows the season is changing and fall is coming and he's not so sure that he is going to be able to sell that lemonade as the weather gets colder. Now he's got some unknowns, the weather is in there. Well, we've got a big unknown, and that's what the people in Washington, D.C. are going to do to businesses next.

When the businessman doesn't know what's going to happen, guess what? In Missouri we have an expression, it's called "hunkering down," or sometimes people say "hunkering down like

a toad in a hailstorm." Well, they hunker down because they're not sure what these guys in Washington, D.C. are going to be doing. And if they're going to pass a health care bill which is going to crank taxes way up on everybody that's working for you, if you're going to pass this great big tax increase, there's some uncertainty there. And if you think the economy is really bad and everybody is struggling and there is not much demand because nobody has jobs and the whole economy is sort of sluggish and sitting like a stone, then you're going to be very careful about doing anything in terms of increasing your productivity or how fast or how efficiently you can make something because you're saying, wait a minute, I'm going to have to make a big investment. I don't know if I can sell enough product with the taxes and everything to be able to pay it off. So uncertainty is a killer in terms of jobs.

And then of course red tape and government mandates. If you make that lemonade stand, test every single glass to make sure it's just crystal pure and you have to file a report with the government and with the EPA that every single glass of lemonade is certified and has been tested on analytical equipment to be sure, what that does is that red tape then makes your cost of product go up and it makes it harder for the guy to run his business. So when you do that, he's not going to hire as many people.

So all of these things are things that are going to make the unemployment rate go up in America. These are the main things. Now, this isn't just TODD just invented this, you can see it by common sense. But also, I've talked to all kinds of businesses. I have had forums of businesses and said, now give us the list of things that make it hard to hire people. These are the lists they come up with, it's not a big surprise. This isn't any kind of rocket science. So my proposition was the Democrat policies are basically in conflict with creating jobs. Let's take a look at what some of those policies are because we have examples of them.

We've been told that all of this woe that the economy is in is President Bush's fault, China's fault. Is it really? Here's the legislation. Democrat tax increases. We just talked about tax increases, the number one enemy of creating jobs. ObamaCare, socialized medicine, \$570 billion, that's what that is supposed to be for a year. That's a lot of money. Who's going to pay that money? You guessed it; it's supposed to be the guys that owns those businesses. Is that going to make for more jobs? No, it's not. SCHIP, \$65 billion. The stimulus, \$7 billion. The benefits and other homebuyer credits, \$23 billion. HIRE Act, \$6 billion. Total package, \$671 billion in tax increases. Is that the way to create jobs? No.

Now the Democrats don't have to look at Republicans to get the right answer, they could look at history. They could look at JFK. JFK was a

Democrat. He understood this stuff, he got it right. JFK came into a time when there was a recession, and he did the right thing; he knew what the right thing to do was, and that was that he cut taxes. And when he did, the economy rebounded. The Democrats could learn from JFK, but they refuse to. They don't want to hear this because they like spending money. Their solution to everything is more money and more government—more government spending, more government programs. They're not listening to JFK, they should have. They could have listened to Ronald Reagan, but they don't like him too well. They don't have to listen to him, they could listen to JFK.

They could also listen to Bush, who inherited a recession in 2000, and in 2001, 2002 and 2003 did a bunch of tax cuts. Those tax cuts got the economy back going again. They could learn from examples, but they're not. Instead, they're following the same path of FDR, who turned a recession into a Great Depression. And they're not listening to Henry Morgenthau, who was the Secretary of Finance under FDR. So these are tax increases. Does that help the job situation? No, not at all. In fact, they harm it.

Well, what other tax increases have we got going? Oh, okay. Not only are we going to increase taxes for all these programs, what we're going to do is we're going to allow all the tax cuts that took place under Bush—which were designed specifically to get the economy going—and we're going to allow those things all to expire or some portion of them to expire, which means that whatever effect they had—because we did move from a recession into some good, strong economic activity in 2004 and 2005 and 2006—whatever effect they had is now going to boomerang, and it's going to hurt us in the same amount in the down side as the other helped us in the up side. And so the ordinary income, the top income rates in 2010, 35 percent, they're going to jump to just under 40 percent. Capital gains is going to go from 15 to 20 percent. Qualified dividends, 15 to almost 40 percent. And the death tax is going to go from 0 to 55 percent.

Let's take an example of what this death tax is going to do. You've got a couple of guys running a farm. You've got 1,000 acres, they've got some good equipment. It's a dad and his son. Tragically, as time goes on, the dad gets old and dies. The farm was owned by the dad. The son wants to take it over—take that equipment, take that acreage and make it go. They hire 10 people to work their farm for them—I just made up the number 10, I don't think they need that many maybe. But anyhow, they got some people that are hired to do that. And so the death tax comes along and says to the son, hey, you owe the government because we're going to tax your dad for dying.

□ 1850

We want 55 percent of the value of that farm. His son takes a look and

says, Well, Mr. Government, if I had to sell half the land, I'd be from 1,000 to 500 acres, and I'd have to choose which tractors that I sell. I couldn't make the farm work. If you take 55 percent out of it, I couldn't make the farm work. The government says, I don't care. Just give me my 55 percent.

It may not be a farm. It may be a small business, but that's what this death tax does. That's why we got rid of the death tax because we want those businesses to keep going. We want that money to be plowed in. And we're willing to live with the fact that somebody may be very well-to-do and very comfortable and having a very nice life. We don't begrudge it to somebody to work hard, save money, and do well. Because we realize if you allow that guy to do well, he's going to hire other people, and that's what creates jobs, and it increases everybody's standard of living.

This policy to allow this thing to go back to 55 percent is going to hurt the job situation. It's going to hurt the economy. It's going to hurt Americans.

Now, the other thing here, the capital gains is the same kind of thing. So if you keep taxing businesses a lot—now, there is this other thing, child tax credit, the marriage penalty and the average, those things are changing back again. And the lowest tax bracket, it goes from 10 to 15 percent.

Now, the Democrats may change this a little bit to make it look pretty to people, but if you don't deal with things like the death tax and qualified dividends and capital gains, these are the things that make the difference in whether or not there are going to be any jobs or whether we're going to have companies going bankrupt.

Well, you got the message. It's really dumb to be raising taxes when the economy is having a hard time. Everybody can tell you that. It just isn't smart. There aren't many people who have been dumb enough economically when the economy is in trouble to want to go ahead and push for the largest tax increase in the history of our country.

Now, I notice my Democrat colleagues were talking about how bad it is that things weren't made in America. They said we've got to bring those jobs back in the country. How are you going to bring jobs back in the country when we create a set of rules that makes it so expensive to build something here that you have a huge advantage somewhere else to build it in another place?

What sort of things would that be, Congressman AKIN? Are you telling me that America's got policies that make it so people don't want to produce things in America? Well, yeah.

Take a look at this. This is the corporate tax rates of a whole bunch of countries—you may not be able to read them all down here. But this is Ireland down here, has a 13 percent; and as you go down the line, let's see, this is Turkey over here. It's gotten to 20 percent. And let's see. Where else do we go?

Sweden, they're pretty socialistic. They're at 20 percent. Then you've got all the way over here to Canada and France. And that green line, that's the United States. We're second only to Japan in terms of corporate tax rates.

Now, it's pretty hard for me to see the logic of complaining about things being made overseas when what we do with our tax policy is tax corporations so heavily that you create an incentive to chase the production overseas. If you're a businessman, you're competing. You're competing with all of these other countries. And what you're going to have to do is be competitive or else people won't buy your product.

So for us in Congress to complain about foreign imports and things when we've got a corporate tax rate that's second highest in the world is once again an example of Democrat tax policy being completely at odds with a goal of a strong economy and lots of jobs. You can't keep taxing the creator of jobs without losing your jobs. I think it's straightforward. I'm trying to make it simple. Because there's one example after the other that our policies just don't make sense.

Here's a chart done in a little more colorful way. We compete with France and Spain, U.K. and China. We talk about China. They've got 25 percent. Here we are. We've got a 40 percent corporate tax rate. Why in the world would we want to be doing that? It just doesn't make sense, and that's why our economy is in trouble. And if we don't fix this, it will just get worse. Because what you do is you hammer a business and you hammer a business, sooner or later it's going to go out of business. Then it's going to be a whole lot harder for somebody to start up a new company and try and put those jobs that could have been there otherwise if our policies had been more favorable.

Now, here's what happened when we did the stimulus. The Democrats' answer to this is, of course, well, the government can direct things and make things work and they'll really make it good. So you've got to take a whole lot of money away from all of those taxpayers. Let's grab a whole bunch of money from the taxpayer, and we're going to spend it in this stimulus bill—which, by the way, went to pay, among other things, the teachers' union in California because they had overspent their pensions and were getting near bankruptcy; same thing in Illinois.

So we're taking this stimulus bill, taking money away from States like mine in Missouri, and giving the money to States that couldn't manage their budgets—like California and Illinois—and taxing the taxpayers all across America to bail out people who were irresponsible. That's where a lot of that stimulus money went. It also went to other various miscellaneous projects and all.

But what was the result of all of the stimulus spending? What you see is we've lost 2.6 million jobs since the stimulus started.

You see, Henry Morgenthau was right. It's not logical that, if government spends a whole lot of money, it makes the economy better.

If you ran your household and you're in trouble economically—you've got a whole lot of loan payments that are coming due, you don't have enough salary to pay those things, you've got some medical bills, everything is not right in your economic little family—and you say to your wife, Hey, here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to go out and get this credit card and I'm going to spend money like mad and that way we can fix our problems here with our little family, your wife would think you were nuts. She'd tell you to stay away from the bar or stop smoking them funny cigarettes because anybody's got the common sense to know that if you're in economic trouble you don't spend money like mad. And yet here we are in economic trouble, we spend money like mad, and then we're wondering how come we lost all of these jobs. What in the world are we thinking?

The Federal Government cannot create jobs by spending lots of money. The Federal Government can spend a lot of money and they can hire people. You say, Wait a minute now. The Federal Government takes a billion dollars and they hire all of these people. Isn't that going to create jobs, because you've got these people working for the government.

Well, here's the trouble with that line of reasoning. It's true; you have government employees. But for every government employee, you've taken money out of the economy which could have been used in the private sector. And when you do that, you lose more than two jobs out of the private sector for every government employee you hire. Obviously, you can't do that very long. Pretty soon you've got more government employees than you do people working in the private sector. And when you've got that, you've got a country that doesn't work anymore economically. And we are rapidly marching toward that point where these economic policies are going to bring a great deal of trouble down on our heads if we don't get sober and start taking a look at the hard facts about economics.

Now, there are a whole lot of people now suffering with unemployment, but it's important for them to understand the principle that you have got to allow businesses to prosper if you want to have employment.

This is where the Democrats should do some reading. This isn't too much reading to do for maybe a week or so. Here it is. Henry Morgenthau, Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Treasury Secretary, before the House Ways and Means Committee, 1939: We've tried spending money. We're spending more than we've ever spent before, and it does not work. I say, after 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started and an enormous debt to boot.

How many times do we have to replay the sad lessons of history? Well, I can hear all sorts of things. Well, Democrats just saying, Well, the Chinese are fiddling with the currency, and President Bush's policies, they're the ones that brought us all this trouble. No, it's not. No, it's not. It's not President Bush's policies.

Look. President Bush spent too much money. His worst year was 2008 when NANCY PELOSI was Speaker of the House here. He had a deficit of \$450 billion. Too much. He shouldn't have had 450.

□ 1900

In 2009, under Obama's Presidency, \$1.4 trillion. That's three times Bush's worst year out of Bush's 8 years, Obama's first year. The amount of debt incurred in that year was three times in 2009 what Bush's worst was. Don't tell me about Bush. Obama makes Bush look like Ebenezer Scrooge. He's a mere piker when it comes to spending money you don't have. And 2010 you say—was 2010 any better? No, it was worse. It was \$2.5 trillion in deficit spending. We aren't listening to Henry Morgenthau. We should learn from Henry Morgenthau, if he is a Democrat. We should learn from JFK. If you want jobs, you can't destroy the businesses.

Take a look at these government deficits. That's the number that I am talking about here. This gives you a little bit of a sense. Now, you can't run your family that way. And over a period of time what we're going to find out is you can't run a country this way either. Because when you have deficits like this what's going to happen eventually is somewhere along the line you got to pay. And who's going to pay? Well, that hasn't totally been determined. But you can bet one thing: When the economy goes bad everybody suffers.

In fact, if I were a happy little Socialist, and I'm not, but if I were a happy little Socialist what I would want to do is I would want to implement an economic policy that made the economy strong because I would get more government revenues to slop around to my friends. If the job of the government is to redistribute money, is to be experts at bailout, which it should not be, but if that is your goal at least you should adopt policies that are going to provide as much revenue to the government as possible.

In 2001 and 2002, if you took a look at the items that the economists would say were the big ticket items of George Bush, one was the war on terror and the other was the tax cuts. And people said, oh, look at all the money the government lost from the tax cuts. So you add the war on terror and you add the cost of the tax cuts, and what you find is that the money that the government was losing in 2001, 2002, and 2003, in terms of the economy being bad, was worse than the tax cut plus the war on terror. And so when the economy is

bad, not only do people not have jobs and poor people suffer, and more well-to-do people suffer, governments suffer too. The governments don't have the money.

And if you happen to be a State governor and you have a balanced budget amendment in your Constitution, such as Missouri, you are in big trouble if you are the governor because you've got to do some serious cutting. And you're not going to be very popular when the economy goes bad and you happen to be a governor. On the other hand, if the economy's doing well it makes you look like a hero because you have plenty of money for everything and you can be benevolent. So when the economy goes bad it sinks all boats, everybody, including government's as well. So this level of deficit spending is unparalleled in our history, and it's going to destroy our country if we continue along the lines.

Here is one way of looking at the destruction right here. See when we have the Chinese buying up our debt, the Chinese are buying Treasury bills and the Chinese are happy because they're getting paid a certain number of percent by the Federal Government for every Treasury bill. And so they're willing to sit there quietly buying up America and they're getting their percent.

Well, what happens when we spend so much money that all the money that we're taking in with taxes can't afford to pay for what our debt service is? This would be the equivalent of you're at home and you've got these credit cards, the credit card companies really like you and everything, and so your family budget, well, you are spending a little more each month, a little more each month, and pretty soon you find out when you add everything all up that you take a look at your credit card debts and the interest rate that you are paying on all those credit cards is more than the amount of money you make. What's that mean? That means you are in deep doo-doo. You are paying more in interest than you are getting in terms of how much money you make.

When the Federal Government gets to this point what's going to happen is that the amount of tax revenue is going to be less than what we're paying on all this debt that we're buying. That's another way of picturing the fact that these economic shenanigans that are going on cannot continue forever. People understand that. It doesn't make a difference if you are a liberal or a conservative. If you have any understanding of economics, you are going to say, look, this is not sustainable. And that's kind of where we are.

This is Social Security and Medicare. This is what their entitlements are going to cost. This is what the U.S. economy is. You can't sustain this with this. It just doesn't work. And so that's where we are. I started with the premise that the Democrat policies,

the Democrat policies are actually destructive to the economy and they're destructive to creating jobs. And what are those policies? One after the other they are policies of increased taxation, more government programs, more government redtape. And the combination of those things, along with excessive Federal spending, basically creates a suction where there is no money in the economy for small businesses and you don't create any jobs. And that's what's going on.

So as I said as I began, it's not a coincidence that the 10 poorest cities in America, the cities that have the highest percent of people below the poverty level, have all been run by Democrats, some for over 100 years. And they keep electing Democrats because we don't understand the basic idea that jobs come from businesses. If you want a healthy economy and businesses, you're going to have to allow some people to prosper and just grit your teeth when you say it, some people are going to get filthy rich. But the benefit of allowing a few people to get wealthy means you are going to have some healthy companies and companies that are growing and hiring people. And when the economy does better, everybody prospers.

You got a guy on the street, just a little kid trying to make some money. He goes around mowing lawns. Now that kid, would he rather be mowing lawns in a rich neighborhood or a poor neighborhood? I would suggest the kid may be dirt poor, but he would do better in a neighborhood of millionaires because when he mows the lawn, they are going to give him a little bit better price. Another neighborhood full of people that can barely afford putting food on the table, they're not going to pay him much to mow their yard for them. So when the economy gets better, it helps everybody. And when you drive the economy into the dirt, then everybody suffers at the same time.

We may not like it or not, but we're all hooked together in this great country called America. Now, I think there are some ways we could get a little bit philosophical here. I think there are some places where we as Americans have to take a look at our forefathers and maybe learn some lessons from them. Our forefathers bled and died and sacrificed greatly for freedom. Their understanding of freedom was maybe a little different than the way we are today in America.

Their understanding of freedom was a sturdy independence, a sturdy character of hard work and wise decision-making. Honest business transactions. Courteousness. A sense of neighborhood and community service. It was so many things that I heard in an Eagle Scout ceremony on Sunday. All of these virtues about being courteous and cheerful and hardworking and diligent and all these kinds of things. And that was the freedom of our forefathers.

It seems to me that to some degree now in America we've started to adopt

an idea of freedom that it means that anybody can do anything they want regardless of whether it's very smart to do or not. And when things don't go well, we just want the government to come and bail us out. That's what I call bailout fever. I don't think that's the freedom of our forefathers. I don't think the idea is instead of saving for your retirement that you go out and buy the ski boat or whatever it is that you don't really have money to buy, you buy it on credit. And you buy a house too big for what you can afford, and then when things don't go right we say I'm a victim. Those rich somebody or others did this to me. It was George Bush's fault. No, it was the Chinese's fault. No, it's not my fault that I spent all that money on the ski boat. That's not freedom. That's not being responsible. Freedom doesn't mean do whatever you want to do and expect the government or somebody to bail you out and blame someone else. It doesn't mean you are dependent on the government or other people.

Freedom means that you have a right to certain basic inalienable rights, the inalienable right of life, to be alive so people don't kill you, and liberty so you have a right to free speech, to share with your neighbor what you think the truth is and to share your opinions. To be able to get in a town hall meeting and challenge people and say, where did you spend that money and why did we do that? We call it free speech. And to pursue happiness.

□ 1910

To pursue happiness, that means whatever gifts God gave you, whatever desires or interest that you can pursue that career, and you can succeed or you can fail based on whether or not you made good decisions, based on your being responsible.

When the Founders a couple of hundred years ago used the word "government," when they talked about government, they did not think about capitol domes. They did not think about Washington, D.C. They thought about the government that a man exercises over his own life, whether he was honest, hard working, trustworthy, whether he was friendly, whether he was a good citizen in the community, that was the use of the word "government."

Today, we tend to think of government in terms of capitol domes. We need to get back to the traditional view of things in America and not look at freedom as license to do things that are irresponsible and then ask Big Brother government to come pick up the pieces, because the government can't afford to do that anymore.

Recent statistics have just come out, I think it was the front page of the Wall Street Journal saying that in a good number of households in America, almost half of them, there is someone in the household that's getting government bailout of some kind, some type of government subsidy.

Now, obviously, if you keep doing that more and more, there is going to

come a point where it doesn't work and that's what all of these graphs and charts are showing, that you can't continuously have the Federal Government spend more and more money without the wheels falling off of everything. We have come to that point, and the point has to be turned around not even so much by people in Washington, D.C. It has to be turned around by the good citizens of America that look back to the strong parts of our past that have made America such a unique Nation, a totally unique Nation in the history of the world, and we have to go back to those virtues and that self-government that's necessary to rebuild this country.

America was built by these crazy people that came here with all these crazy ideas. They didn't know what "can't" meant. They didn't know what "I can't do it" meant. They just tried. Some dream became a vague possibility, then possibility, and then eventually that dream became reality and America was built one dream at a time.

It became so common we gave it a name. We called it the American Dream. It was a phenomenon of freedom, of citizens being able to be free to succeed or fail without all kinds of government red tape, without excessive government taxation, without bureaucrats looking over your shoulder. They could go out and try. And a lot of them failed.

There was one guy, his name was Edison. He failed a lot. He was trying to make light bulbs. He made a hundred of them. Every one of them didn't work. When he got done with a hundred, he said, well, now I know a hundred ways not to make a light bulb, and he kept on trying. That was that American can-do spirit.

He doesn't ask the government to subsidize his light bulb company; he didn't go to the government for a bailout. He didn't say his mom didn't give him enough chocolate chip cookies so he was really a victim. No, he just went back to the drawing board and kept on working.

And that was the American Dream. So America became a more and more unique country. We came to be the oldest country with the written constitution that we have. We were known for going all over the world when there is a hurricane or a tragedy. Where there is a war where people are being oppressed, you find the American soldiers there helping out. And people around Europe can be cynical; but when there is trouble, they sure like it when America is around.

America was different in other ways too, and in its perhaps most important way America was unique because we were built on a religious principle. We believe that there is a God and that that God granted to all human beings certain basic fundamental rights. We wrote it in a thing called the Declaration of Independence.

We believe that every individual should have the right to be alive. You

shouldn't just shoot people. People should have a right to be alive unless they do something terrible. Second of all, that they should have a right to liberty, the liberty to speak their own, to have the right to free speech and to own property, not to have their property stolen from them by the government and given to someone else.

We didn't believe it was ever the government's job to take money from one person and give it to the other. That was socialism, that was theft, that was immoral. You had the right to own what you worked hard for and you also had the right to pursue whatever it was that God had gifted you to do. If you were to be a singer, God would say go out and be strong and do a good job being a singer.

If you are going to be a businessman, be a good businessman. Treat your employees well. Work hard, be diligent. Don't waste; don't pollute.

If you are going to be someone who is a doctor, go to the top of your profession. Do a good job. Take care of people well. Come up with new procedures and new drugs so that people can be healthy.

And over a period of time the standard of living increased in America because we believed in these basic ideas, these traditions of America. But freedom never was a license to take from other people. It was never a license to make the government the big bailout expert.

That's not what our country was built on. And if we go back to this other approach, it doesn't work economically.

So Americans, again in November, they have a choice. You can believe all of the sophistry and the blame of George Bush and this and that, but we have seen the stimulus bill and it flat didn't work. We have seen the taxation of small businesses. We have seen unemployment go up and up and up, and people have a sense that all is not right economically at the tremendous rate we are spending money. They know that we can't keep on this path. And so the choice is to be made November.

Which approach are we going to take? I think the approach of our forefathers to have a sturdy, hard-work ethic, integrity and each person being responsible and accountable for their own decisions, and scaling back that Federal Government, I think a lot of Americans today believe that in an effort to maybe in a good intended effort to do right things.

We have made the government no longer a servant but a master. I think a majority of Americans now are threatened by the government. I think a lot of Americans realize the government is the problem, not the answer.

I believe those people are going to be rendering a verdict on that regard, into that regard. There is a point when the government becomes the master and not the servant. How close are we to that point? How much control do we really have to the machine that is

promising so much more than anybody has any reasonable expectation that there is revenue to pay for?

How much control do you have when the government agent talks to you about runoff of water? How much control do you have when you want to look for a loan for your kid to go to college and the government is the only one doing it. The government is in the flood business; they are into the automotive businesses. We have got Government Motors now, not General Motors.

They are in the insurance business. The government is going to take over all of health care. How much do you want the government to run and how good a job have they done with the Post Office?

We have a Department of Energy, that's an interesting Department, isn't it, created to make sure that we are not dependent on foreign oil. Boy, I am sure glad we have got that Department working hard.

We have got a Department of Education. That's a wonder too. The government runs that Department of Education. I think the Wall Street Journal about 3 weeks ago said the ACT test scores of kids that are being tested that want to go to college, 24 percent of them, are ready for college. That's amazing, isn't it? You have got a government product, State government and Federal Government product where 24 percent of them are acceptable.

If you bought gasoline and every tank of gas out of 100 tanks, 24 of them worked and the other 76 of them didn't work, you wouldn't buy gas there very much.

So we can let that government agency then run our health care? Is this what we really want in America? I don't think so. People in Missouri had a referendum on that socialized medicine bill, and they passed by 80 percent a measure to challenge that in court. It is unconstitutional to require people to buy health insurance, they be part of this big government bailout, socialized medicine boondoggle. They didn't want it.

And I have a feeling there is a whole lot of other States full of people who are tired of the government being the master and of the attitude that freedom means you can do whatever you want and if things go wrong you are going to live with the bailout.

We cannot continue the level of taxation that we have done. We have to start rethinking, and it doesn't start in Washington, D.C.

I think there are a lot of people that think if we got things right in Washington, D.C., everything would take care of itself. No, that's not right.

Freedom starts in the hearts of individuals that believe that God gives them basic rights. And when the Federal Government starts to take away the basic rights that God gives you, that's when there is really big trouble. That's where there is a clash; that's where true patriots stand up and say, enough already.

That's what happened in the War of Independence. That's what happened in the other wars of America's past. When people threatened our premise that God gives you certain basic rights, and they got in the way of that, that's when Americans stood up and they acted.

□ 1920

Today, there are a lot of Americans that are saying to our Federal Government, No, this is not what America is built on. Our government was built on justice. It was built on the concept that people are equal before the law. If you are a rich man or a poor man, it makes no difference. Everybody is equal before the law. That's not bailout fever.

We have given up justice and gone to socialism. It hasn't worked in Europe. It didn't work for the USSR, and it won't work for us. We need to go back to what works, and that is people are equal before the law and people are free to take a gamble and try to run their business, and if it doesn't work, then they've got to pick themselves up and try again and not complain that they need more bailouts.

In short, there is a reason why there is unemployment today. There is unemployment today because it was created by government policies. And those government policies have to change. We have to take the chains off of American business, and we have to go back to the principles that work.

Well, we've talked about a couple of very philosophical kinds of things: Justice, which is a very important word. Justice does not mean that Lady Justice who has the blindfold over her eyes is peeking. It does not mean that she peeks and gives a special deal to one person or another person. We have created now, with the law, a special bill to create a whole bailout section of the Federal Government so Lady Justice can peek and give money to one person and maybe not to another.

What confidence does the individual American have that the government is going to come and bail them out when they need it? Is the government going to be there? Do you want to be servant to Big Government or do you want to be a free person? Do you want to breathe the fresh air, live in the fresh air and the sunshine of being free, knowing that you also have to be responsible? Or do you, instead, choose the gloomy path of the promise that the government will take care of you even though you know that it can't economically, or it will not take care of you well and allow you to live in some sort of pseudofreedom where you don't make responsible choices and you hope the government will take care of you when it doesn't work?

That's where we are as Americans. It has to start in our hearts. Freedom starts in the hearts of self-governing people who love God. They love their family and they love their country. And America is full of those people.

And I have confidence, I have confidence that the American public still has a passion for freedom, still has a love for this country, still cares about the American Dream and wants to live in an environment where they can be free to exercise their God-given gifts and abilities. They want their children to grow up in a better condition than they are. They want to see civilization building and suffering going down. But the only way you can do that is you have to allow some people to prosper. You can't knock down all the businesses and anybody who makes money and expect to have jobs. You just can't do that. It doesn't work.

And so we come back as we started. Do you want jobs? Let's get rid of all this excessive taxation. Let's do what every President in the past has done when there is a recession—JFK, Ronald Reagan, Bush. Let's cut the taxes. That is what we've got to do. We've got to change the regulations in the banking system so there's liquidity for businessmen to raise money. We have to create an environment where people aren't afraid of some new whacky idea coming down the pike and totally changing the business climate. We have to create a condition where people have confidence that there will be a stable government in this country which is not hostile to business, and we've got to cut the red tape and the government mandates.

What that means is we basically need to take a look at the Federal Government, and we need to say anything that the Federal Government does not have to do, it has to be just gotten rid of. We need to delegate it back to the States or the local governments. We've got to get the Federal Government out of all kinds of businesses they have no constitutional reason to be in, and we have to focus on the basic things, which are justice. We need to make sure there is a level playing field at home for people to do their work, and there has to be a secure environment internationally, which means we have to have national defense. Those are the basic functions of justice. Those should be the functions of limited government.

When the government gets too expensive, you have to go back and say, Wait a minute. Let's do the basics. Let's do the basics well, and everything else the Federal Government does not have to do, then let's get rid of it. That's where we have to be going. That's a clear path. It's something that's not going to happen overnight because it has to change in the hearts of Americans, in the families of America. In the churches and places of worship, there has to be an understanding that it's not the job of the government to take care of everything that goes wrong in everybody's life, because it won't work.

And then Washington, D.C., will change, reluctantly, but Washington, D.C., will change, and we will see a new America and a brighter day and a better day for Americans. We will see a

place where people are employed and excited about their work and where there's a responsibility and a vigor and a vibrancy that was so common of the old Yankee that the Europeans used to make fun of. And once again, that Yankee will be back again, Yankee Doodle. They used to sing about it to make fun of us, but as we have seen tsunamis and hurricanes and all kinds of crises around the world, they like old Yankee Doodle to come to help them.

And so I'm proud to be an American. I know that you're proud to be Americans. We have to move back to the policies that made this country great.

And I see that a very good friend of mine, a former judge, a Congressman from the great State of Texas is here to join us before long, and perhaps he will carry on along these lines. I know he is a man who loves God. He fears God. He loves his country, and he loves his family, and that's why I love him. And so I think the next hour will be exciting, and I urge you to stick with us here.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of a 5-minute Special Order speech in favor of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is vacated.

There was no objection.

LET'S FIX AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to speak here on the House floor and have that opportunity that was provided by those willing to show the greatest love, according to Jesus, willing to lay down their lives for their friends, their countrymen, so that we could have these freedoms. And when you read the Declaration of Independence, it talks about we are endowed by a Creator with certain inalienable rights, and all men were created equal; now, not with equal talents, not with equal abilities, not with equal money or substances. That was not the point. In God's eyes, we are equal. In the eyes of the Creator, we are equal. And so we are supposed to do the best we can with what we've got.

And as my friend from Missouri was talking about light bulbs, I couldn't help but scratch my head because here in Washington, we are told that the most environmentally friendly majority in the history of the country is in charge now. But I wanted a light bulb that was incandescent so I can see better, because it takes so dadgum long for those others with the curl in there to warm up where you can see. And sometimes, there's a tiny closet there, and I flip the light switch on, well, I just need to flip it on and off. Well, now I've got to leave the energy on long

enough so the bulb warms up to where I can see what's in there. And it's interesting, you can't find, you will not be provided an incandescent light bulb. And we read in the past week that the last incandescent manufacturing plant in the United States proper has now gone out of business.

So what have we done as the most environmentally conscientious Congress in history? We have got light bulbs that have mercury in them—mercury, the substance that does not go away. If you get mercury in your system, you don't get it out. If you get too much, it's lethal. It builds up over time. So what are we doing? We are raising the level of mercury as high as we can get it, this lethal substance, and you say, what is going on?

□ 1930

How can we be environmentally friendly when we are forcing everybody on Capitol Hill to have mercury throughout their offices? It is just one of those things.

If we are all created equal, and the thing we are endowed with by our Creator, inalienable rights, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, nobody is guaranteed happiness, but the right to pursue happiness. Nobody is guaranteed, under our Declaration or under the Constitution, that everybody is going to share and share alike. That is called a socialist manifesto: from those according to their ability to those according to their needs. It is a lovely idea but it has never worked. It always goes bankrupt because as I found when I was in the Soviet Union as an exchange student talking to farmers who had not been out in their field all day on a great day, well, it was mid-morning, but to that point, that was prime time to work. When I spoke a little Russian back then, I asked, When do you work in the field? They laughed. One of them said I make the same number of rubles if I am out there, pointing out in the sun in the field that really looked bad, or if I am here in the shade. So I am here in the shade. That is why socialism doesn't work. If you pay somebody the same thing to be working out in the hot field, sweating and wearing themselves out, and pay them the same as if they sit in the shade and cut up with their friends, they are going to be in the shade.

The reason free market systems fail is not because a free market system doesn't work; it works beautifully. You do need a government to make sure that everybody plays fairly, not to take away from those who are able to produce more than others, not to kill the incentive for people to actually produce, but to provide a level playing field where everybody can compete equally. That is the job that we are supposed to have. That is the job of the government.

And we have gotten too busy in this body trying to tell everybody what they can do, and as the President says share the wealth, spread the wealth,

you kill incentive and you kill productivity. So when you get right down to it historically, what always brings free market systems to an end is when a governing authority begins to meddle and ruin the free market system and start converting it over to a socialist system. And once a governing authority is able to manipulate the free market system over into a socialist system where you are trying to spread the wealth, you are killing incentive and you are creating class warfare, you are creating all kinds of problems. You are trying to do the things that this government is doing right now, and then you kill the free market system. Not because it doesn't work, but because you have now converted it to a socialist system, which always fails by its own weight. And then that obviously requires a dictator, somebody who forces a sharing of the wealth, a killing of incentives across the board so people do all they can to sit in the shade and not do anything and not produce and not help out their neighbors because they don't have to.

So it broke my heart to keep hearing our President talking about the rich, anybody making over \$200,000. He is talking about small business people. He is talking about people I have had come pleading to me: Stop destroying what I have spent my life building. I had nothing. I had nothing, worked 20 hours a day, put what little bit I had at risk and eventually was able to hire another employee and another employee and another employee. And finally I have in some cases 20, 30, or 140 in one case, one man that was talking to me, 140. Now he is down to about 60, I think he said. But you are killing me. You are killing my business. And you make people hate me because of how hard I worked and how much I sacrificed to build this small business. And in the process, you made me put 80 people out of work.

We should not be about class envy. The reason a free market society works is because there is fairness. When you have a government that is about fairness, then people compete. Entrepreneurship springs up all around and people comes up with ideas. It is worth risking what they have to make things work. That is free enterprise.

And when we have an administration that is so busy stirring up class envy and trying to get people to hate the people that have come to me and said, yeah, I have been making over \$200,000 a year. I have been pouring every dime back into my business. It grows and grows, and we have been able to hire more people. Now I have to lay them off, and you have got people hating me because they think I'm rich. And now you have a President that says I don't deserve the same tax rate that everybody else does. That I deserve to be punished because I took risk and I sacrificed and I grew my business and I hired people and I was fair to them and they loved their jobs and they worked hard, and it grew bigger and better and

we had a great product. And now I have a President that is getting people to hate me and saying I don't deserve to pay the same rate as other people? I mean, how much must a person despise those kind of entrepreneurs who have built a business and created out of nothing. They worked hard with ingenuity and sacrifice, created a thriving business, how much must a President or an administration despise those people to say, I am willing not to help the people that I call middle class if I have to give the same rate to the people that make above \$200,000. I am willing to punish the middle class and not let them have the same rate as they do now. I am willing to let their tax rates zoom up with the biggest tax increase in American history come January 1, I am willing to let that tax rate go up if you try to make me allow those entrepreneurs who have built a business on their own, if you try to make me give them the same tax rate as the middle class, because you see I want to punish them. They have made too much money. They took risks, they laid it all out there on the line.

One fellow talked about how he didn't even own his own trailer, those kinds of things. And he built a business, and now our President says he is rich and he needs to be punished. That is the way you end a free market system. You spread the wealth evenly from those who have risked it all and give to those who have been sitting in the shade watching them work. You kill the free market system. You kill the jobs.

So we have an administration out there saying we are all about jobs, that is our main focus. But by the way, we are going to push through this health care bill that the majority of America says don't, don't, don't, and they pushed it through. And then you see people laid off. So many people have come to me about family members, themselves, cuts in pay, laid off because the cost of the health care that was supposed to go down when this administration ramrodded and crammed this bill down America's throat without letting people truly understand all that was in it. You lose your country if it is based on a free market system when an administration and a Congress tries to make it socialist.

□ 1940

Now, I realize some people think, oh, Socialist is such a horrible word. It's really a very nice concept, actually. If you look at it, you know, we want everyone to share and share alike. Sometimes we're told that growing up: we want to share and share alike. As a parent, I tried to make sure that all three of our girls shared and shared alike, but if one of those children could take what she was given and parlay that into something even better and more productive, that was hers. Whether she shared it or not was completely up to her. I would encourage her to use and develop the talents and what she has been provided.

It is true, as an old preacher of ours used to say, that there are an awful lot of people around here who are born on third base and go through life thinking they hit a triple, and there is an arrogance that goes with that. Sometimes, if somebody comes from a poor family and has everything handed to him, then he thinks he has hit a triple because somebody else placed him on third base.

Either way, we're supposed to never forget that the Founders believed—and most Americans according to the polls believe—that the blessings we have are a gift of God; and if we turn our backs on him long enough, though he is long suffering, patient and full of grace, eventually, he will say, Okay, you turned your back on me long enough. Now I turn my back on you, and you disappear. You head to the dustbin of history.

Now, I wasn't going to bring up this matter. I was very pleased that the President was talking about the tax holiday concept. The problem is he is bringing it up over a year and a half later than it was brought to his attention by me. I told him at the time, Look, you promised everybody a tax cut. You know, of course you put a \$250,000 cap on income. I don't think it ought to be there.

Moody's did an independent study. They said the tax holiday idea, the way I read it, increases the 1-year GDP more than any other stimulus proposal if we pass this stimulus, a tax holiday idea that just said, you know, for the next 2 or 3 months, every dime you make stays in your check and does not go to the Federal Government. You get to keep your income tax in your check. Whether you want to make it 2 or 3 months, you keep it. If we passed it today and if the President signed it today, tomorrow they would have that money in their checks. It wouldn't go to Washington.

At the time, it was going to cost so little money compared to the money the government was spending. In fact, that's where I got the idea in 2008. Of course, we had the \$700 billion Wall Street bailout, which was a huge mistake, and I hope our leaders do finally realize that, but it was a huge mistake. Both sides of the aisle had about half of their Members buying into it. \$700 billion. That could have provided 4 months of every worker in America getting every dime of their income taxes back, along with all of their Social Security money for those 2 months, and it would have let the employers keep the 2 months of matching money that they normally would have to put in to match what the workers put in. That would have given businesses a boost, and it would have given employees this tremendous boost.

We did a little survey of people in our districts: What would you do? Look at your check and at how much money is going to Washington. What would you do with it?

Some said, Look, we've got a gas guzzler, and it's worth less than what we

owe for it, so we can't trade it in. We can't get another car. We're stuck. Yet, if we got 2 months of our own income tax in our checks, we'd be able to finally buy a good, fuel-efficient car. We'd be able to save money on gas in the future.

The truth is that GM and Chrysler wouldn't have needed to have been bailed out because people would have been out there buying cars. Actually, the idea for the tax holiday, when I had it in 2008, came from seeing that \$700 billion for the Wall Street bailout and then hearing here in Washington that, between the Federal Reserve and the things this government was going to do, it would probably end up costing between \$3 trillion and \$9 trillion just to try to get the economy going again. That's when I inquired: How much do we anticipate will be paid for the whole year of 2008 in Federal personal income tax? It was around \$1.21 trillion. \$1.21 trillion and \$3 trillion to \$9 trillion over here, maybe more. I like the \$1.21 trillion. It's at least three to 10 times cheaper, and it's people keeping their own money that they've earned. Then you wouldn't have needed all the bailouts, and everybody could have kept all of their income taxes for a whole year.

I don't like a government's not paying its bills as it goes along. It's not a good idea, but to say no personal income tax for a year when that is so much cheaper than what the Bush administration pushed with the \$700 billion bailout, with the \$800 billion that is now a \$900 billion porkulus bill, from January of 2009 under President Obama, and with the \$400 billion land omnibus bill the following week—all these stimulus packages, so-called—man, it would have been so much cheaper to have said, People, just keep all of your income taxes for a year.

Well, there weren't that many people here on Capitol Hill who felt like they could politically risk signing onto a full year of no income tax. Especially after January when we had the \$800 billion or the \$900 billion, my position was you could take the \$800 billion stimulus package and what was left of the original \$700 billion Wall Street bailout and pay for a whole year of no income taxes being paid. Just take the money from those stimulus packages and bailouts and use those to let everybody keep their own income taxes for a year.

John Shadegg was one. He loved the idea of having a whole year of no income tax. Boy, you talk about a stimulated economy. People would have been buying cars. They would have been eating out. They would have been buying products, buying new homes. Even with 2 months of people's own income taxes, Newt Gingrich's folks ran the numbers for me. He was very helpful. As I recall, an average family, just an average household in America, in just 2 months, was going to have around \$5,000 or so of extra money. Some people said, You know, we got behind on our mortgages when gasoline got to \$4

a gallon the year before, and we just have not been able to catch up; but you let us have all of our income taxes for a couple of months, we'll catch up, and then you won't have to do all of these ridiculous government programs to try and save people's mortgages.

There are other things that need to be done, but I brought this up when I met the President back when he very first came to our Republican Conference, which was held down in the basement here in the Capitol. I said, Look, I don't care who gets the credit. You can put your name on it. Do it. Moody's says it will help the GDP more in one year than any proposal that has been proposed. Even our own leadership's proposal wasn't going to do that much good in one year in the Republican Party. I don't care who gets the credit.

I wouldn't have minded if he had taken the idea back then and had used it, but he waited over a year and a half and then started describing, virtually almost verbatim, the way I described it over a year and a half ago and then in some of the same speeches said, But you know what? The Republicans don't have any good ideas. Well, I don't care that somebody's taking credit. The old saying goes—Reagan said it often—it's amazing what you can get done here in Washington if you don't mind who gets the credit.

□ 1950

So I don't mind other people taking credit for the idea. I do mind when it's followed or even preceded by the words, "But Republicans don't have one good idea." I think we need to pray for the President's memory. I know the pressure is great. I know it's an awesome responsibility. It's easy to forget things. Boy, do I know that. My wife will sure tell you that. It's easy to forget things. But before you go alleging that Republicans have no good ideas, think for a moment where you got the idea you're proposing. That's what I would offer, Mr. Speaker. And we keep hearing the President and others here on the floor saying that Republicans have not one good idea. They're the Party of No. No good ideas. None at all.

None at all? We need to pray for people's hearing, because there are a lot of fantastic proposals that are being tossed out there that would be wonderful. We do need major tax reform. I'll never forget how depressed I was after I left the Republican annual retreat in early 2006. I had been elected, sworn in in January of 2005, and started Congress with all kinds of hopes and dreams of making the country a better place. A year later we're told, look, there's a tiny chance we might not have the majority next year. It's possible we could lose. We don't think it will happen. We know we had talked about major tax reform this year, but instead we're going to just try to get through this year, not do anything big that will make people mad one way or the other, keep the majority next November, and then we'll come back in

January 2007 and do the major stuff like major tax reform.

Well, we've lost a lot of people who have been defeated since then, because America wants to see us keep our promises. There have been a lot of promises made by this administration, this majority, of things that were going to be done. Even on the crap-and-trade bill that passed here last year, the promises were made over and over: Oh, no, this bill is not going to cost jobs. It's going to create jobs. Create green jobs. After seeing what the people in charge have done in taking away incandescent light bulbs, it makes me wonder, are those green jobs going to have to carry around mercury, too, or what?

The American people are letting it be known, they're not happy with people not keeping their promises here. Actually the truth is, I have a real fear as a Republican that we only get the majority back one more time in my lifetime and if we do not keep our word this time, we'll never get it back again in my lifetime.

There are some great ideas. There are things that should be done. We've talked about balanced budgets for years. And there are some in the prior administration that equated compassion with paying money. There are an awful lot of people in the current administration that equate compassion with giving away somebody else's money. But that's not compassion. That's hurting free enterprise, killing incentive, killing jobs. And when you take away somebody's job, you have hurt them. Psychologists say that's one of the most devastating blows to a person mentally, emotionally, to lose a job. Losing a spouse is up there. Losing a child is right up at the top. But losing a job is one of the most devastating things that can happen. And here we keep doing things over and over.

The crap-and-trade bill is still hanging out there. The rumors are there could be a lame duck session and people that have lost their seats, who were afraid to vote for it before in the House or Senate will vote for it in a lame duck session because they've already been voted out, they've got nothing to lose, and maybe hoping if they vote for it in November or December, maybe the administration will give them a job if they really cater to them and help them do that. That would be disastrous. But if you go back and read the crap-and-trade bill, as I did, you find out that back there it seemed like—and I read from it, standing right over there—around page 900 and something, there was a fund that was created in the bill that would reimburse people or give them a little allowance for those people who lost their jobs as a result of that bill being passed.

Now I know my friends across the aisle who stood up over and over and said, no, this isn't going to cost jobs, this is going to create green jobs, they obviously had not read the bill because I know them well enough to know,

they wouldn't have stood up and intentionally lied. They wouldn't have done that. It's just that they had not read the bill so they were not aware that whoever's staffer or special interest group wrote that bill, they knew people would lose their jobs and that's why they were creating a fund in the bill to give an allowance to people that lost their jobs as a result of the bill. And as I pointed out then, the good news, I guess, to those that voted for that bill is that if it becomes law, no doubt in my mind, a lot of the people that voted for that bill will lose their job as a result of voting for that bill, and they've got an argument that they're entitled to funds from the bill for losing their job as a result of the bill. So they may have created a fund that will help them out.

But we should have a balanced budget amendment, and it's a shame on the Republicans for not getting that done when we had the White House, the House and the Senate. We should have gotten it done. Shame on the Republicans for in the last administration when we had the majority agreeing to tax cuts that we knew would stimulate the economy and but for those tax cuts we would have gone into a massive depression. But the economy was stimulated, and we brought more money into the Federal Treasury than had ever been brought into the Treasury; but the problem is we spent more than had ever been spent in history—up until, of course, this administration. And whereas I can remember being over here on this side and hearing colleagues beat up on Republicans because we were in the majority and to have a \$160 billion deficit was unthinkable, it was just so irresponsible—until, of course, the Obama administration, the Democratic majority, and then actually 10 times that much of a deficit is okay. It was not okay at \$160 billion and it's certainly not okay at 10 times that.

People in the American public were promised change, and yet what they got was not really change; they got 10 times more of what they had before. I don't know why President Bush is being demonized, because this administration and this Congress is pushing 10 times more of exactly what the prior administration did. So instead of condemning the Bush administration and the Republican majority, they ought to be rightfully saying, you know what, we thought you had a good idea when you ran up a \$160 billion deficit, that was such a good idea, we have gone 10 times that, and we're really running up a deficit now.

Shame on Republicans when we had the chance in 2005 and President Bush ran on shoring up Social Security. Now there was all kinds of discussion of privatization; what does it mean, what is it really going to do? And by September of '05, it was obvious the President's political capital was gone and what he had hoped to do would not be done. But I still had hope, because I

knew what had been done with the Texas employment retirement system. They took real money from people's checks that were supposed to go toward retirement and put it in a retirement account. Real money in a real retirement account. Now that was invested and it got hit pretty hard after 9/11. It got hit very hard after "Chicken Little" Paulson ran around and said the financial sky was falling if we didn't give him the \$700 billion slush fund he wanted, and so the market fell 777 points in one day, a self-fulfilling prophecy, and the money lost by everybody that had anything invested.

There was one Republican that I went to because he was so well respected for his business and financial mind, and I said, Look, I've talked to a lot of Republicans and I've talked to some Democrats. Something we could get through here even in September of '05 was a bill that had one thing in it that just said, Social Security tax money for the first time in the history of Social Security, since its inception in the late 1930s, will require that that Social Security tax money be put into the Social Security trust fund.

□ 2000

I don't want to hear any ridiculous talk about lock box. There's never been one. I want one. I want there to be Social Security tax money put into the Social Security Trust Fund and stop putting IOUs in there, markers that are noninterest bearing, and we have to borrow 42 cents out of every dollar that we spend. Stop it already.

Now, to put the Social Security tax money into the Social Security Trust Fund will require us to actually make some tough calls. And since this majority condemned us all the time for spending too much money, then I think a good idea would be to go back to the budget of 2006. I know some are talking about 2008. I think it ought to be 2006. We'll go back to that budget. And I think that would help us maybe take care of the issue and get us a good start of being able to put all of the Social Security tax money into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Now, the Republican is so brilliant he told me that we could never do that. I was shocked. Why not? Because the government would probably buy bonds with it. They'd be the biggest bondholder. We could never allow that to happen. Well, not really. We could create a treasury note that's interest bearing. So it's not risky. It doesn't put the Social Security Trust Fund at risk. That money makes interest. And it's there, and we stop having a Ponzi scheme. A very simple idea, and a Republican has proposed it. But when we were in the majority, our leadership didn't go for it, but I hope and pray they will if we get the majority again.

Health care. Boy, we've seen what the ObamaCare bill has done to health care. And even though people were promised there would be no rationing, then we put a doctor in charge of it

who's talked about, as I recall, not whether there would be rationing but when and who would be rationed. So all of the promises about no rationing, apparently those were not true. And it could be going back to the problem I alluded to earlier. We need to pray for the President's memory so he can remember those things that were promised.

Now, another Republican idea—and I think everybody on this side of the aisle has signed on to it, is in support of it, is an energy bill, an energy plan that says use what we've got. Make sure that when coal is used that it doesn't harm the environment. Put scrubbers on there to make sure that it goes in the environment clean and we don't harm the environment. We can do that.

Use uranium. Use nuclear facilities like we do with our ships and our submarines. It works. That's why we have sailors who are able to go underwater on submarines and stay submerged for 6 months. I was told by some of my friends from A&M that went in the Navy and were on subs underwater 6 months at a time. And he said, You know why we have to come up every 6 months? I said, I assume, to refuel.

Oh, no. Those submarines could stay underwater just on and on and on. We have to come up so that the crew doesn't go crazy, because the nuclear subs could just stay under there as long as they needed to from a practical standpoint.

But there's a source. Most of America didn't notice when our committee voted to put the second-largest source of uranium in this country off limits. People in Louisiana, Republicans and Democrats alike, have been screaming out, You are doing more damage to our State with the moratorium on gulf drilling than the oil spill did.

And when you hurt an economy and you put people out of work, tragically they don't care about the environment. They're just trying to survive. The only countries that can really do much about the environment are those who have such a prolific economy that they can take care of it. But when you have people out of work and they're just living hand to mouth and they're trying to get by, they don't care about the environment because their economy doesn't allow it.

Now, I and, as far as I know, everybody on this side of the aisle wants to develop alternative energy sources. But what a great idea, and it's been proposed, and we pushed it over and over. Instead of raising taxes and—as the President's promise would happen when he was running for office—having energy prices skyrocket if we use coal to make power, instead of doing those things—and as one 80-something-year-old lady told me from east Texas, I was born and raised in a house with no electricity. We had a wood-burning stove. And now the price of energy has gotten so high, I'm going to have to let it go. I can't pay for it. And it looks like I

may end up going out of this world the way I came in, in a home with a wood-burning stove and nothing else, no other power, because people are wanting the prices to skyrocket. And that poor woman, not to be able to pay for her energy bill. No, that's no good way to do it.

God bless this country with more natural resources than any other country in the world. Yeah, the Middle East, they may have more oil with things that are being found around the world, who knows. But we have massive amounts of natural gas, maybe the most coal in the world. We've got nuclear power. We've got wind power. We've got solar. We've got all kinds of things, so many things that can be harnessed.

But if you use the energy with which we have been blessed and designate—I don't care if it's 25, 50 percent of the royalty that we get back from the energy or from the mining or whatever it is, designate that that will all be used to find and research and develop alternative energy sources, so that when we run out—it will be well before we run out. We've got over 100 years of natural gas that's been found and finding more all the time. Before we run out, we'll be able to convert to alternative energy without raising anybody's taxes, without making any 80-year-old women living alone have to go without power, keep the power prices down. That's a Republican solution. And I have friends on the other side of the aisle over here that would sign on to that if their Speaker wouldn't punish them for doing so.

Another idea. I know it's not popular with the administration, but we call it the U.N. Voting Accountability Act. Very simple. It says, in essence, recognize the fact, first of all, that every country is sovereign. You can make your own decisions. We're not going to tell you what to do in your country. We shouldn't. But any country that votes against the United States' position in the U.N. more than half the time, the following year will get no financial assistance from us.

As I've said before, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free. And there are some countries that we keep pouring cash into thinking they'll end up loving us because we'll buy it. Not only do they not love us, they have even greater contempt because they know we know they don't like us and yet we're just pouring money into them. It makes them not only not like us; it makes them have no respect at all for us. It's so unnecessary.

Something that should have been passed in 2006 when we had the majority and we had the chance and some of the people that said they would not let it go through are no longer here—some are—it's a zero-baseline budget bill. It just says there are no automatic increases in any Federal departments' budgets. There's a Republican solution for you. If you want your budget in-

creased in the Federal Government, you have to come justify it, and we ought to put those budgets online where people can watch them like—I think the President put it this way, that he was going to go through the budget line by line with a fine-tooth comb. He was going to put JOE BIDEN in charge of doing that, too. They were going to get rid of everything that was waste.

□ 2010

Well, that hasn't happened yet. Since he is an honest man, I am sure it will eventually happen. But it sure hasn't happened yet. But it would sure happen if you let Americans see every Federal department's budget, how they were spending their money, put it up online, make them put those purchases online the way Congress is now doing. There would be people watching all right.

And if we had a tax holiday and people saw for a couple months how much money they were actually sending to Washington, they would demand it. And they would be watching to see how every Federal department was spending money.

And hey, I got another one for you. This is a Republican proposal from this Republican. Our leaders have not endorsed this. I am just tossing this out. But you know, we had to come in here in August, it cost an awful lot of money to turn all the lights back on, do everything to go back into session, but we did just so that we could get \$10 billion extra to go to the Department of Education to help so-called teachers. Well, it turns out across America only about 50 percent of all the public education employees are teachers.

Well, if you did away with the Department of Education here in Washington and kept that, \$68 billion I believe is what we are spending this year, and divided it among the less than 14,000 independent school districts in America, I am open to a good formula how to do that, just average it would be between \$5 million and \$6 million dollars for every school district in America. Most school districts could really use that money. And boy, that would help education. You wouldn't need near as many bureaucrats because there wouldn't be as many decrees from on high here, Mount Olympus here in Washington. The local school districts would be able to comply with the Constitution, because the Constitution does not enumerate education as a power in the Constitution, which under the 10th Amendment means it's reserved to the States and to the people, the local folks.

Another idea—they say we've got none—another idea, after having been to China years ago and having talked to CEOs about why you went. The corporate tax here is 35 percent. You lump on some of the State income taxes, you lump on local property taxes, all of the taxes, some of them are paying 40 percent, 50 percent in tax for their companies, competing with countries like

China that don't exceed 17 percent. And if they are a big enough company moving over from anywhere in the U.S. to China, they'll cut you a deal, no income tax for a while, because they get it.

If we dropped our corporate tax to 12 percent, I have had CEOs with major companies say we would be rebuilding a plant in the U.S. almost immediately when we went to a 12 percent corporate tax. And what would happen? More and more people would go back to work, and more and more people would be able to pay their taxes. And more and more revenue would come into the Federal Treasury. And then we would be able to buy more and more of those mercury lights that are going to create such a problem for the environment.

There are a lot of very good solutions. And so I don't mind somebody taking my idea. I love it. I think it's the highest form of flattery. But I don't appreciate it when it's followed up with a comment that we have no ideas, no solutions. We've got a lot of them. We just aren't allowed to make amendments on the floor to get those to the floor where they could pass.

I want to finish tonight with a tribute. It is a great honor for me to recognize one of America's greatest songwriters in our Nation's history, who turned 70 years of age this week. He is a man to whom we are indebted for many of the songs that lifted us, especially those of us who are baby boomers, from our low points because his songs spoke our feelings. They spoke our despondence, our hopes, our joy, and especially the joy that comes from loving other people.

I had not met Paul Williams until recent years, but I knew the man well through his lyrics. I have known the man through his lyrics for decades. The hauntingly clear and comforting voice of Karen Carpenter shared some of his songs and expressed our hearts that we had only just begun to live. White lace and promises. A kiss for luck and we're on our way.

For those of us who have loved, he expressed for us to the one we love that we won't last a day without you. And that all we needed was just an old-fashioned love song coming down in three-part harmony, one I am sure they wrote for you and me. Or that we had so much in common because we were all building a home for the family of man.

Paul Williams expressed for us through the voice of Barbra Streisand that wonderful love could be soft as an easy chair, love fresh as the morning air, one love that is shared by two, I have found with you. Like a rose, under the April snow, I was always certain love would grow. Love, ageless and evergreen, seldom seen by two.

Even though Paul had not yet recognized that he had a drinking problem, he forecast years down the road as a recovering alcoholic in that song with the words every day a beginning. Paul has now done that for over 20 years, as

he has made each day a beginning. He knew for many of us that rainy days and Mondays always get us down. And some days it truly did feel that it was, through Helen Reddy's voice, you and me against the world. Sometimes it feels like you and me against the world. When others turn their back and walk away, we could always count on you to say just the right thing, Paul Williams. But for all the times we cried, you always felt the odds were on our side, and we found consolation in that.

Paul Williams asked the ongoing question through the voice of Kermit the Frog as to why are there so many songs about rainbows? And what's on the other side? Well, someday we'll find it, the rainbow connection, because Paul is a lover, a dreamer like me.

Paul, of course, is widely considered one of our most prolific, talented, creative singer-songwriters. He has won awards called Oscar, Grammy, and Golden Globe on multiple occasions, and was nominated for these awards—more than 20 times he has been nominated over the span of his illustrious musical career. Even though he also wrote the theme for "The Love Boat," he nonetheless is deeply loved by so many like me who carry his lyrics in our hearts for life.

As a further attestation of his talent and wide-ranging artistic scope and appeal, his songs have been recorded by a diverse array of our most famous classic and modern musicians such as Elvis, Frank Sinatra, Willie Nelson, Ella Fitzgerald, Ray Charles, Tony Bennett, Sara Vaughan, Luther Vandross, R.E.M., and Jason Mraz, among so many others, in addition to the ones I mentioned already tonight. But this House has time restraints, so there is not enough time to mention all of them.

But additionally, Paul has appeared as an actor in many movies and has been a favorite on television shows. He was one of the most frequent guests on Johnny Carson's "Tonight Show." I used to love to watch him. Always he had the most contagious sense of humor that caused viewers instantly to smile when he was introduced as a guest, because you just knew you were going to laugh. You always knew you were going to laugh with him in the room.

On one such occasion he was a guest on "The Tonight Show" with Burt Reynolds. The chemistry was extraordinary and hilarious. It was only days later when Burt Reynolds called Paul, impressed with how much fun they had had together. He wanted to get with Paul, with Johnny Carson's beloved writer Pat McCormick, plus a few other favorites like Sally Field, Jackie Gleason, and Jerry Reeves and others and make a movie. They did. And the fun they had making that movie came across from the screen to the audience, which made it one of the most successful movies in history.

□ 2020

It was called "Smokey and the Bandit."

There were other Smokey sequels, but that first one was the best. Paul said, Billy Bob Thornton told him that in the South "Smokey and the Bandit" is not considered a movie, it's considered a documentary. Though some identify him in the movies as the short guy, I personally know him to be a full 10 feet tall.

In recognition of Paul's significant and long-lasting musical impact, he was inducted in 2001 into the Songwriters Hall of Fame, and he is currently serving as the president and chairman of the board of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, ASCAP.

But Paul will tell you that having hit rock bottom through his drinking, God blessed him even still. He lifted him and gave him new life with an even more infectious joy. He became a Christian and although some alcoholics fear that they will not be nearly as creative without drinking, Paul showed that's absolutely not the case.

Like virtually all creative geniuses, though, he has known times when he had trouble writing. On one such occasion he went to Nashville, collaborated and out came one of the most touching and autobiographical songs which became a huge hit for Diamond Rio. The words reflected a part of his own struggle with alcoholism and his recovery, though the woman who made him face the truth was not waiting for him when he completely sobered up and dried out. The words say it better than I can:

"I said, Hello, I think I am broken, and though I was only jokin', you took me by surprise when you agreed. I was trying to be clever, for the life of me I never guessed how far a simple truth would lead. You knew all my lines; you knew all my tricks; you knew how to heal that thing no medicine can fix. And I bless the day I met you, and I thank God that He let you lay beside me for a moment that lives on. And the good news is I'm better for the time we spent together. The bad news is you're gone."

"Looking back it's still surprising, I was sinking; you were rising, and with a look you caught me in mid-air. Now I know God has His reasons, but sometimes it's hard to see them when I awake and find that you're not there."

"You found hope in hopeless; and you made crazy sane, you became the missing link that helped me break my chains. And I bless the day I met you, and I thank God that He let you lay beside me for a moment that lives on. And the good news is I'm better for the time we spent together. The bad news is you're gone."

And Paul knows, however, that all things work together for good for those who love God and are called according to His purpose. But that doesn't mean that everything is good; it's certainly not. But thankfully things have worked out so that Paul has been a gift

to this planet and to the millions that he has touched.

Paul has a true driving passion for his family, for his work as a drug rehabilitation counselor with Musicians' Assistance Program, a nonprofit program created by and for the benefit of musicians to help them overcome their substance abuse issues. In 1989 Paul obtained his certification as a drug rehabilitation counselor from UCLA and has for the last 20 years been actively imparting the lessons to others that he had to learn himself the hard way.

He has been given a number of awards for his humanitarian efforts and remains a shining example of someone who has used fame not for self-centered ends but to promote the well-being of others. He is indeed devoted to his church, to the Lord, and just as I found out after I got dumped in college by my girlfriend, God had something else waiting that was supposed to have been all along.

One of the great mysteries in this world, though, is that it is only after a broken heart so often that our hearts are stretched enough and then mend even bigger with a greater capacity for loving others. And so it was with Paul. Subsequently he met and married Mariana. They are happily married and have the deepest love for and pride in their wonderful family.

Though he is a Democrat by political affiliation, he, just as Jesus did, can mingle and feel right at home even

with the least of these, like me. His favorite anonymous quote, apparently he is one we can all take to heart with our interactions with one another, "Care deeply; give freely; think kindly; act gently; and be at peace with the world."

One of my favorite quotes is: "Before the rising sun we fly; so many roads to choose, we start out walking and learn to run. We've only just begun."

We are so grateful that the good Lord led Paul down a road of expressing what we felt, though Paul expressed it in a way we never could. But we can certainly sing, even though some of us should do so only privately.

But it is also true, as Paul wrote, "Time won't change the meaning of one love." And though 70 years of age this week, Paul Williams is ageless and ever, ever green.

Here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all the world to read, as long as there is a United States, it will ever be recorded that Paul Williams lived, laughed, loved, and was immensely helpful to those around him doing the same thing; and hopefully he will be around the rest of my life to add the music to my life.

And, yes, to borrow from another of his songs: "As a traveling boy, Paul was only passing through, but we will always think of you."

God bless you, Paul, for blessing us. Happy birthday.

I yield back.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SPEIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SPEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KENNEDY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, September 22.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 22.

Mr. COFFMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 16, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second quarter of 2010, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alcee Hastings	5/28	6/1	Qatar		456.00		8,990.00				9,446.00
	6/1	6/3	Belgium		896.00						896.00
Alex Johnson	5/28	6/1	Qatar		456.00		8,640.60				9,096.60
	6/1	6/4	Belgium		1,344.00						1,344.00
Dr. Mischa Thompson	5/31	6/4	Belgium		1,792.00		1,005.70				2,797.70
Committee total					4,944		18,636.30				23,580.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, July 28, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Betsy Markey	4/8	4/9	UAE		389.00						389.00
	4/9	4/10	Pakistan		360.00						360.00
	4/10	4/11	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	4/11	4/12	UAE		0.00		9,672.10				9,672.10
Per diem returned					324.00						324.00
Committee total					503.00		9,672.10				10,175.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON, Chairman, July 31, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ed Pastor	4/5	4/7	Mexico		645.00						645.00
Commercial airfare							631.48				631.48
Hon. John Salazar	4/7	4/8	United Arab Emirates		262.91						262.91
	4/9	4/10	Pakistan		257.62						257.62
	4/10	4/11	Afghanistan								
	4/11	4/12	United Arab Emirates								
Commercial airfare							9,637.10				9,637.10
Hon. Jack Kingston	6/1	6/2	Cote d'Ivoire		240.00						240.00
	6/3	6/3	Ethiopia		379.28						379.28
	6/4	6/4	Kuwait		310.75						310.75
	6/5	6/7	Italy		909.12						909.12
							(³)				
Hon. Lincoln Davis	5/29	5/30	Kuwait		410.00		20.70				430.70
	5/30	5/30	Iraq								
	5/30	6/2	Qatar		996.00						996.00
	6/2	6/5	Syria		819.33						819.33
	6/5	6/6	Lebanon		62.00						62.00
	6/6	6/6	Germany								
Commercial airfare							8,060.70				8,060.70
Misc. Embassy costs									1,101.97		1,101.97
Hon. David Obey	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Hon. John Olver	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Hon. Ed Pastor	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Hon. Tim Ryan	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Hon. Kay Granger	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Hon. John Carter	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Hon. Betty McCollum	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Beverly Airmar Photo	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
John Blazey	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Marjorie Duske	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Anne Marie Chotvac	5/29	5/31	France		939.89		564.71				1,504.60
	5/31	6/2	Norway		826.24		192.39				1,018.63
	6/2	6/3	Ireland		249.49						249.49
							(³)				
Misc. Embassy costs									1,095.30		1,095.30
Celes Hughes	6/1	6/4	Iraq						35.00		35.00
Commercial airfare							7,239.35				7,239.35
Committee total					27,463.83		33,917.43		13,185.27		74,566.53

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID R. OBEY, Chairman, July 30, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Philippines, Cambodia, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, April 3–10, 2010:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	4/4	4/6	Philippines		474.00						474.00
	4/6	4/8	Singapore		155.00						155.00
	4/7	4/7	Thailand								
	4/8	4/9	Cambodia		232.15						232.15
	4/9	4/12	Taiwan		582.90						582.90
Commercial airfare							14,495.70				14,495.70
Timothy McClees	4/4	4/6	Philippines		474.00						474.00
	4/6	4/8	Singapore		155.00						155.00
	4/7	4/7	Thailand								
	4/8	4/9	Cambodia		232.15						232.15

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	4/9	4/12	Taiwan		582.90						582.90
							12,929.90				12,929.90
	4/4	4/6	Philippines						³ 339.02		339.02
	4/7	4/10	Thailand						³ 75.87		75.87
	4/8	4/9	Cambodia						³ 703.32		703.32
	4/9	4/12	Taiwan				32.66		³ 1,486.66		1,519.32
Visit to Afghanistan, Pakistan, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, April 4–10, 2010, with CODEL Carper:											
Hon. Rob Wittman	4/6	4/7	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	4/7	4/8	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	4/8	4/11	Pakistan		262.00						262.00
Commercial airfare							8,179.10				8,179.10
Thomas Hawley	4/6	4/7	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	4/7	4/8	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	4/8	4/11	Pakistan		262.00						262.00
Commercial airfare							8,179.10				8,179.10
Visit to United Arab Emirates, Afghanistan, May 29–June 1, 2010:											
Hon. Larry Kissel	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		23.00						23.00
	5/31	6/2	United Arab Emirates		273.18						273.18
Commercial airfare							5,698.10				5,698.10
Hon. John Kline	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	4/8	4/11	United Arab Emirates		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							9,198.10				9,198.10
Hon. Frank Kratovil, Jr.	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		115.00						115.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Commercial airfare							5,698.10				5,698.10
Hon. Duncan Hunter	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Commercial airfare							9,198.10				9,198.10
Hon. Martin Heinrich	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/31	6/2	United Arab Emirates		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							5,698.10				5,698.10
Robert DeGrasse	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/31	6/2	United Arab Emirates		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							5,698.10				5,698.10
Aileen Alexander	5/29	5/30	United Arab Emirates		143.00						143.00
	5/30	5/31	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/31	6/2	United Arab Emirates		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							9,198.10				9,198.10
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, May 31–June 4, 2010 with STAFFDEL Hughes:											
Michael Casey	6/1	6/3	Iraq								
	6/3	6/3	Kuwait								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Roger Zakheim	6/1	6/3	Iraq								
	6/3	6/3	Kuwait								
Commercial airfare							7,168.60				7,168.60
Visit to Cote D'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Italy, June 1–7, 2010, with CODEL Inhofe:											
Doug Lamborn	6/2	6/3	Cote d'Ivoire		36.00						36.00
	6/3	6/3	Burkina Faso								
	6/3	6/4	Ethiopia		53.00						53.00
	6/4	6/5	Kuwait		59.00						59.00
	6/5	6/5	Afghanistan								
	6/5	6/7	Italy		224.00						224.00
Visit to Korea, Vietnam, June 8–19, 2010:											
Craig Greene	6/9	6/11	Korea		667.86						667.86
	6/11	6/18	Vietnam		673.00						673.00
Commercial airfare							7,767.70				7,767.70
John Chapla	6/9	6/11	Korea		592.86						592.86
	6/11	6/15	Vietnam		751.34						751.34
Commercial airfare							7,767.70				7,767.70
Committee total					9,392.34		124,075.76		2,604.87		136,072.97

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Indicates delegation costs.

HON. IKE SKELTON, Chairman, July 31, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. GEORGE MILLER, Chairman, Aug. 3, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Cliff Stearns ³	4/30	5/2	Italy		375.66				327.33		702.99
Committee total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Did not travel due to late votes on departure date. Expenses are cancellation fees.

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN, Chairman, July 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BARNEY FRANK, Chairman, July 23, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jasmeet Ahuja	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.44						390.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00		(?)				78.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		611.36						611.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Douglas Anderson	5/30	6/3	South Korea		1,278.00						1,278.00
Round-trip airfare							7,738.30				7,738.30
Hon. Howard Berman	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.44						390.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00		(?)				78.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		531.36						531.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Douglas Campbell	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.44						390.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00		(?)				78.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		556.97						556.97
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Hon. Russ Carnahan	4/30	5/1	Qatar		320.44						320.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		38.00		(?)				38.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		646.36						646.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Theodros Dagne	4/7	4/9	Zimbabwe		734.00						734.00
	4/9	4/10	Kenya		428.00						428.00
	4/10	4/11	Sudan		342.00						342.00
	4/11	4/12	Kenya		428.00						428.00
Round-trip airfare							10,179.90				10,179.90
Hon. Bill Delahunt	5/31	6/4	Turkey		1,714.00				4 328.62		2,042.62
Round-trip airfare							4,926.10				4,926.10
Brian Forni	5/31	6/4	Turkey		1,714.00						1,714.00
Round-trip airfare							6,735.10				6,735.10
Lindsay Gilchrist	5/17	5/20	Tanzania		638.00						638.00
Round-trip airfare							6,239.30				6,239.30
Dennis Halpin	5/30	6/3	South Korea		1,260.00						1,260.00
Round-trip airfare							7,738.30				7,738.30
Hans Hogrefe	4/6	4/9	Philippines		711.00						711.00
	4/9	4/12	Indonesia		699.00						699.00
Round-trip airfare							12,155.50				12,155.50
Eric Jacobstein	5/6	5/7	Panama		254.00						254.00
Round-trip airfare							926.20				926.20
Jessica Lee	4/6	4/9	Philippines		711.00						711.00
	4/9	4/12	Indonesia		699.00						699.00
Round-trip airfare							10,765.50				10,765.50
Noelle Lusane	4/7	4/9	Zimbabwe		734.00						734.00
	4/9	4/10	Kenya		428.00						428.00
	4/10	4/11	Sudan		342.00						342.00
	4/11	4/12	Kenya		428.00						428.00
Round-trip airfare							11,618.70				11,618.70
Julie Kim	6/6	6/12	Poland		1,485.12						1,485.12
Round-trip airfare							1,359.80				1,359.80
Alan Makovsky	5/29	6/1	United Arab Emirates		1,408.48						1,408.48
	6/1	6/3	Bahrain		792.50				4 233.78		1,026.28
	6/3	6/5	Lebanon		664.00						664.00
Round-trip airfare							8,062.20				8,062.20
Robert Marcus	5/29	6/1	United Arab Emirates		1,408.48						1,408.48
	6/1	6/3	Bahrain		792.50						792.50
	6/3	6/5	Lebanon		664.00						664.00
Round-trip airfare							8,062.20				8,062.20
Hon. Michael McMahon	4/30	5/1	Qatar		340.44						340.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		28.00		(?)				28.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		636.36						636.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Hon. Brad Miller	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.44						390.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00		(?)				78.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		721.36						721.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Daniel Mulholland	6/6	6/9	Poland		742.56						742.56
Round-trip airfare							2,144.50				2,144.50
Walter Oleszek	6/6	6/12	Poland		1,485.12						1,485.12
Round-trip airfare							1,359.80				1,359.80
Joo-Jin Ong	5/30	6/2	South Korea		1,000.00				4 1,442.57		2,442.57
	6/2	6/4	China		632.00						632.00
Round-trip airfare							11,530.50				11,530.50

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Donald Payne	4/7	4/9	Zimbabwe		734.00						734.00
	4/9	4/10	Kenya		428.00						428.00
	4/10	4/11	Sudan		342.00						342.00
	4/11	4/12	Kenya		428.00						428.00
Round-trip airfare							11,043.80				11,043.80
Peter Quilter	4/5	4/6	Nicaragua		256.00						256.00
	4/6	4/8	Honduras		472.00						472.00
Round-trip airfare							2,034.70				2,034.70
Sheri Rickert	5/17	5/21	Tanzania		385.00						385.00
Round-trip airfare							8,572.90				8,572.90
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.44						390.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00		(³)				78.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		528.36						528.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Hon. Edward Royce	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.44						390.44
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00		(³)				78.00
	5/2	5/4	Pakistan		561.36						561.36
Round-trip airfare							8,577.90				8,577.90
Margarita Seminario	4/4	4/9	Peru		1,872.00						1,872.00
Round-trip airfare							6,181.70				6,181.70
Amanda Sloat	6/2	6/6	Bosnia		558.00						558.00
Round-trip airfare							1,535.20				1,535.20
Maureen Taft-Morales	4/5	4/9	Peru		1,248.00						1,248.00
Round-trip airfare							6,181.70				6,181.70
Robyn Wapner	5/6	5/7	Panama		254.00						254.00
Round-trip airfare							926.20				926.20
Clay Wellborn	4/5	4/10	Peru		1,615.00						1,615.00
Round-trip airfare							6,181.70				6,181.70
Lisa Williams	5/14	5/16	Kazakhstan		878.00						878.00
Round-trip airfare							6,111.00				6,111.00
Brent Woolfork	4/5	4/10	Brazil		1,211.00						1,211.00
Round-trip airfare							6,825.70				6,825.70
Committee total					43,628.77		235,759.70		2,004.97		281,393.44

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Indicates delegation costs.

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Chairman, July 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Andrew Wright	5/24	5/29	Dubai		1,631.24		2,376.10		540		4,547.34
Scott Lindsay	5/24	5/29	Dubai		1,673.24		2,376.10				4,049.34
Boris Maguire	5/24	5/29	Dubai		1,673.24		2,287.10				3,960.34
Christopher Bright	5/24	5/29	Dubai		1,654.36		2,198.10				3,852.36
Committee total					6,631.98		9,237.40		540.00		16,409.38

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS, Chairman, July 31, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Brian Baird	4/5	4/9	Columbia		1,441.20		3,230.70		1,389.00		6,060.90
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart	4/6	4/8	Columbia		720.60		2,266.70		1,389.00		4,376.30
Commercial airfare											
Hon. Bart Gordon ³	4/30	5/2	Italy		375.66				327.33		702.99
Louis Finkel ³	4/30	5/2	Italy		375.66				327.33		702.99
Hon. Brian Baird	5/29	5/30	Kuwait		410.00		20.70		196.28		626.98
	5/30	5/30	Iraq								
	5/30	6/2	Qatar		996.00						996.00
	6/2	6/5	Syria		819.33				782.36		1,601.69
	6/5	6/6	Lebanon		62.00				123.33		185.33
	6/6	6/6	Germany		0.00						
Commercial airfare ⁴							8,060.70				8,060.70
Nicholas Palarino	5/29	5/30	Kuwait		410.00		20.70		196.28		626.98
	5/30	5/30	Iraq		0.00						
	5/30	6/2	Qatar		996.00						996.00
	6/2	6/5	Syria		819.33				782.36		1,601.69
	6/5	6/6	Lebanon		62.00				123.33		185.33
	6/6	6/6	Germany								
Commercial airfare ⁴							8,060.70				8,060.70
Committee total					7,487.78		21,660.20		5,636.60		34,784.58

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Did not travel due to late votes on departure date. Expenses are cancellation fees.⁴ Entire trip except in/out of Iraq (mil/air).

HON. BART GORDON, Chairman, July 29, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Eleanor Holmes Norton	8/5	8/5	Haiti								
James Tymon	5/30	6/1	Ireland		\$866.00						
	6/1	6/2	Belgium		\$700.00						
	6/1	6/4	Czech Republic		\$416.00		\$5,877.70				\$5,877.70
Committee total					\$1,982.00		\$5,877.70				\$5,877.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Chairman, Sept. 30, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Janice Schakowsky	4/5	4/7	Middle East		800.26						
	4/8	4/10	Middle East		395.00						
Commercial airfare							11,125.39				12,320.65
Adam Lurie	4/5	4/7	Middle East		800.26						
	4/8	4/10	Middle East		395.00						
Commercial airfare							9,292.39				10,487.65
Frederick Fleitz	4/5	4/7	Middle East		800.26						
	4/8	4/10	Middle East		395.00						
Commercial airfare							9,292.39				10,487.65
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	4/5	4/7	Mexico		1,290.00						
Commercial airfare							1,326.67				2,616.67
Michael Delaney	4/5	4/7	Mexico		1,290.00						
Commercial airfare							1,730.17				3,020.17
Curtis Flood	4/7	4/9	Mexico		600.00						
Commercial airfare							2,614.67				3,214.67
Nathan Hauser	4/7	4/9	Mexico		600.00						
Commercial airfare							2,614.67				3,214.67
Hon. Peter King	5/29	5/31	Middle East		415.18						
Commercial airfare							13,864.90				14,280.08
James Lewis	5/29	5/31	Middle East		415.18						
Commercial airfare							13,599.90				14,015.08
Harry Hulings	5/29	5/31	Middle East		415.18						
Commercial airfare							13,599.90				14,015.08
Hon. Anna Eshoo	5/29	5/31	Europe		1,428.12						
	5/31	6/2	Europe		1,376.43						
	6/2	6/3	Europe		306.37						
							(³)				3,110.92
Mark Young	5/31	6/2	Middle East		1,575.90						
	6/3	6/5	Middle East		124.03						
	6/5	6/6	Middle East		114.00		8,181.80				9,995.73
Commercial airfare											
George Pappas	5/30	6/1	Middle East		1,575.90						
	6/2	6/4	Middle East		124.03						
	6/5	6/6	Middle East		114.00						
Commercial airfare							8,181.80				9,995.73
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	6/1	6/2	Europe		139.00						
	6/2	6/3	Europe		350.00						
	6/3	6/4	Europe		400.00						
Commercial airfare							3,181.90				4,070.90
Michael Delaney	6/1	6/2	Europe		139.00						
	6/2	6/3	Europe		350.00						
	6/3	6/4	Europe		400.00						
Commercial airfare							2,509.20				3,398.20
In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which the Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.											
Committee total											118,243.85

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. SILVESTRE REYES, Chairman, July 30, 2010.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first, second, and third quarters of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Juan Lara	4/04	4/10	Japan		2,924.00		9,228.80				12,152.80
Javier Martinez	4/04	4/10	Japan		2,924.00		9,228.80				12,152.80
Mike Brinck	4/04	4/10	Japan		2,924.00		9,228.80				12,152.80
Committee total					8,772.00		27,686.40				36,458.40

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB FILNER, Chairman, Aug. 13, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO POLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 6 AND JUNE 12, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Price	6/6	6/8	Poland		1,002.57						1,002.57
John Lis	6/6	6/9	Poland		1,435.14		2,109.00				3,544.14
Asher Hildebrand	6/6	6/10	Poland		1,913.52		1,324.80				3,228.32
Margarita Seminario	6/6	6/12	Poland		2,870.28		1,324.80				4,195.08
Committee total											11,970.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE, Chairman, July 12, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO SENEGAL, LIBERIA, KENYA, TANZANIA, AND MALI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 3 AND JULY 15, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Price	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	7/3	7/4	Senegal		185.02		(3)				185.02
Hon. Vern Buchanan	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. Lorraine Miller	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. John Sullivan	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
John Lis	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Margarita Seminario	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Asher Hildebrand	7/3	7/4	Senegal		191.00		(3)				191.00
Rachael Leman	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Brad Smith	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Janice Robinson	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Pearl Alice Marsh	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Karen Robb	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Shalanda Young	7/3	7/4	Senegal		241.00		(3)				241.00
Hon. David Price	7/4	7/6	Liberia		580.00		(3)				580.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	7/4	7/6	Liberia		580.00		(3)				580.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Hon. Vern Buchanan	7/4	7/6	Liberia		580.00		(3)				580.00
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Hon. Donald Payne	7/4	7/6	Liberia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. Lorraine Miller	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Hon. John Sullivan	7/4	7/6	Liberia		432.00		(3)				432.00
John Lis	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Margarita Seminario	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Asher Hildebrand	7/4	7/6	Liberia		410.00		(3)				410.00
Rachael Leman	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Brad Smith	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Janice Robinson	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Pearl Alice Marsh	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Karen Robb	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Shalanda Young	7/4	7/6	Liberia		460.00		(3)				460.00
Hon. David Price	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,089.15		³ 362.00				1,451.15
Hon. David Dreier	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,140.00		³ 362.00				1,502.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,044.12		³ 362.00				1,406.12
Hon. Vern Buchanan	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,140.00		³ 362.00				1,502.00
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,280.00		³ 4,394.70				5,674.70
Hon. Donald Payne	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Hon. Lorraine Miller	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Hon. John Sullivan	7/6	7/9	Kenya		995.00		³ 362.00				1,357.00
John Lis	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Margarita Seminario	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Asher Hildebrand	7/6	7/9	Kenya		950.00		³ 362.00				1,312.00
Rachael Leman	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Brad Smith	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Janice Robinson	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		(3)				1,050.00
Pearl Alice Marsh	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Karen Robb	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		(3)				1,050.00
Shalanda Young	7/6	7/9	Kenya		1,050.00		³ 362.00				1,412.00
Hon. David Price	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. Keith Ellison	7/9	7/10	Tanzania		224.00		4,687.00				4,911.00
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. Vern Buchanan	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. Donald Payne	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. Lorraine Miller	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. John Sullivan	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
John Lis	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Margarita Seminario	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Asher Hildebrand	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Rachael Leman	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Brad Smith	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Janice Robinson	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Pearl Alice Marsh	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Karen Robb	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Shalanda Young	7/9	7/11	Tanzania		448.00		(3)				448.00
Hon. David Price	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
Hon. David Dreier	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
Hon. Allyson Schwartz	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	7/11	7/12	Mali		110.00		³ 5,910.00				6,020.00
Hon. Vern Buchanan	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
Hon. Donald Payne	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
Hon. Lorraine Miller	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
Hon. John Sullivan	7/11	7/12	Mali		212.00		³ 5,910.00				6,122.00
John Lis	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(3)				848.00
Margarita Seminario	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(3)				848.00

September 15, 2010

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H6761

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO SENEGAL, LIBERIA, KENYA, TANZANIA, AND MALI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 3 AND JULY 15, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Asher Hildebrand	7/11	7/15	Mali		648.00		(³)				648.00
Rachael Leman	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(³)				848.00
Brad Smith	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(³)				848.00
Janice Robinson	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(³)				848.00
Pearl Alice Marsh	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(³)				848.00
Karen Robb	7/11	7/15	Mali		848.00		(³)				848.00
Shalanda Young	7/11	7/13	Mali		746.00		(³)				746.00
Committee total											112,603.99

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE, Chairman, Aug. 12, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ISRAEL, AFGHANISTAN, AND GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 2 AND AUG. 7, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Tammy Baldwin	8/3	8/4	Israel		146.00						146.00
	8/5	8/6	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	8/7	8/7	Germany		176.25						176.25
	8/4								³ 100.00		100.00
	8/6								³ 24.00		24.00
	8/4								³ 10.00		10.00
	8/5								³ 20.00		20.00
	8/6								³ 16.00		16.00
	8/7								³ 53.25		53.25
	8/7								³ 1.80		1.80
	8/7								³ 47.30		47.30
	8/7								³ 5.40		5.40
	8/6								³ 135.00		135.00
Committee total					350.25				412.75		763.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Meals, hotels and incidentals.

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN, Chairman, Aug. 26, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HAITI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED ON AUG 6, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steny Hoyer	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Hon. David Price	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Hon. Donna Edwards	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Hon. Yvette Clarke	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Hon. Aaron Schock	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Mariah Sixkiller	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				
Elizabeth Murray	8/6	8/6	Haiti				(³)				

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. STENY H. HOYER, Chairman, Sept. 7, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Keith Ellison	3/29	3/31	Saudi Arabia		1,347.52						1,347.52
	3/31	4/1	Jordan		360.00						360.00
	4/1	4/2	Israel		402.00						402.00
	4/2	4/5	Egypt		542.05						542.05
							⁴ 14,640.99				14,640.99
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	2/13	2/14	Morocco		592.10		(³)				592.10
	2/15	2/16	Spain		901.61		(³)				901.61
	2/17	2/20	Australia		1,471.29		(³)				1,471.29
Hon. Jeff Flake	2/5	2/7	Germany		⁵ 419.60		(³)				419.60
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	3/30	3/31	Qatar								
	3/31	3/31	Yemen		342.00						342.00
	3/31	4/1	Bahrain								
	4/1	4/3	Pakistan		180.00						180.00
							⁴ 10,045.20				10,045.20
Alan Makovsky	1/28	1/31	Sweden		1,058.00						1,058.00
							⁴ 9,051.90				9,051.90
Committee total					7,616.17		33,738.09				41,354.26

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.⁴ Round trip airfare.⁵ Per diem that was not reported in Q1 report. All receipts have been received.

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN, Chairman, Sept. 8, 2010.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill S. 2868, the Federal Supply Schedules Usage Act, as amended by the House, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR S. 2868, THE FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULES USAGE ACT OF 2010, AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

¹ S. 2868 would amend federal law to allow disaster relief organizations to use the federal supply schedules of the General Services Administration to procure goods and services from private firms for disaster preparedness and response activities. CBO estimates that the increasing the number of purchases would increase offsetting receipts by less than \$500,000 annually. Because those fees can be spent by GSA without further appropriation, the net budgetary impact of the legislation would be negligible.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9373. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-501, "Frank Kameny Way Designation Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9374. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-526, "Gun Offender Registration Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9375. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-534, "Transportation Infrastructure Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9376. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-533, "Redevelopment of the Center Leg Freeway (Interstate 395) Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9377. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-525, "Not-for-Profit Hospital Corporation Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9378. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-524, "Approval of the Transfer of Control of Starpower Communications, LLC, and its Cable Franchise and Cable System to Yankee Cable Acquisition, LLC Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9379. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-523, "Health Insurance for Dependents Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9380. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-502, "Summer Pool Safety Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9381. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-500, "Dorothy Irene Height Memorial Library Designation Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

9382. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-527, "Wastewater System Regulation Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1620. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4785) to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost-effective, commercial off-the shelf technologies to reduce home energy use (Rept. 111-594). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6126. A bill to provide for 100 percent expensing for capital property placed in service on or after September 8, 2010, and before 2012; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the continued provision of health care services to certain veterans who were exposed to sodium dichromate while serving as a member of the Armed Forces at or near the water injection plant at Qarmat Ali, Iraq, during Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. LOEBACK, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 6128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to issue prospective guidance clarifying the employment status of individuals for purposes of employment taxes and to prevent retroactive assessments with respect to such clarifications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 6129. A bill to release the Bodie Wilderness Study Area in Mono County, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LINDER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 6130. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from participation in Federal health care programs to individuals and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NYE:

H.R. 6131. A bill to impose conditions on the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of the United States Joint Forces Command and on workload reductions of civilian personnel of that command, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 6132. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a transition program for new veterans, to improve the disability claim system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 6133. A bill to require the lender or servicer of a home mortgage, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a prompt decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 6134. A bill to provide for a 10 percent reduction in pay for Members of Congress; to make Federal civilian employees subject to a period of mandatory unpaid leave, and to reduce appropriations for salaries and expenses for offices of the legislative branch, during

fiscal year 2011; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 6135. A bill to extend contract periods for renewable energy for Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6136. A bill to reduce the heat island effect and associated ground level ozone pollution from Federal facilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6137. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession of a firearm by a person who is adjudicated to have committed a violent act while a juvenile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6138. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to afford Federal employees residing in the District of Columbia the same opportunities for political participation as are available with respect to certain Federal employees residing in Maryland or Virginia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 6139. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 482 East Main Street in Malone, New York, as the "Almanzo Wilder Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6140. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the "Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SESTAK (for himself, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 6141. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, to authorize a national grant program for on-the-job training; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 6142. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Education to, jointly, develop a workforce training and education program to prepare workers for careers in the alternative energy and energy efficiency industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 6143. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 190-day lifetime limit on inpatient psychiatric hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H. Con. Res. 317. Concurrent resolution commemorating the national partnership between Alpha Phi Alpha, Kappa Alpha Psi and Omega Psi Phi Fraternities and Big Brothers Big Sisters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. BACA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MEEK of Florida):

H. Res. 1619. A resolution honoring the bi-centennial "call for independence" that led to the establishments of the independent sovereign nations of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. CAO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H. Res. 1621. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the historic founding of Catholic Charities USA; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ARCURI, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H. Res. 1622. A resolution honoring the historic contributions of veterans throughout all conflicts involving the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 1623. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a national day of remembrance for United States nuclear weapons program workers and uranium miners, millers, and haulers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WU, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 1624. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Coastal States Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. POSEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CAO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 1625. A resolution recognizing the important role zoos, aquariums, and other wildlife organizations have played in the response efforts in the Gulf region following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill that began on April 20, 2010; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATSON:

H. Res. 1626. A resolution commending the National Student Leadership Conference for organizing college campus experiences for high school students for more than 20 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 39: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 208: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 303: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 571: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 881: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 892: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1034: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 1079: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1133: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1189: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1210: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1228: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 1328: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1340: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1362: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1522: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1618: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1663: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1718: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1806: Mr. WOLF and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1818: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1868: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1895: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1927: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2000: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2021: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2030: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2115: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2378: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2408: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2443: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 2485: Mr. BOREN and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 2547: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2579: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 2672: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2941: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3286: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3421: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3488: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 3652: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. KRATOVIL.
H.R. 3655: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
H.R. 3666: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3729: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 3752: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3765: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3786: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3839: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 4037: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4114: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4197: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4278: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 4322: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4339: Mr. BACA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HARE, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4353: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4477: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4554: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4555: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
H.R. 4632: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4677: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 4689: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. HARE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4735: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4769: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4770: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4788: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4794: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 4806: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4844: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4879: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4921: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 5029: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5034: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5071: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5081: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 5095: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 5162: Mr. ISSA, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5177: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 5191: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STARK, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5288: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BAIRD, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 5295: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 5324: Mr. HIMES and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5339: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 5376: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 5434: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 5460: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 5483: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 5504: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5523: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 5625: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 5680: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 5689: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 5732: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 5735: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 5794: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5803: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 5804: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5820: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 5828: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 5833: Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HELLER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5853: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 5861: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 5916: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 5925: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 5926: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 5928: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5944: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LOEBBACH.
H.R. 5961: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 5972: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 5982: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 6059: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 6065: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 6071: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 6072: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. COBLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 6081: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 6085: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 6091: Mr. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.J. Res. 94: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 224: Ms. JENKINS.
H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. WOLF and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 309: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 311: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. FOXX.
H. Con. Res. 316: Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MACK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 93: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 111: Mr. CASSIDY.
H. Res. 173: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 397: Mr. BARROW.
H. Res. 767: Mr. WU.
H. Res. 1319: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 1343: Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 1348: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 1377: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H. Res. 1430: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 1433: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HARE, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FARR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WATT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FOXX, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. KIND, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SIRE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 1438: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 1442: Mr. LATTA and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 1444: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 1449: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BARROW, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BLUNT.
H. Res. 1461: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 1476: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 1488: Mr. BACA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Res. 1498: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 1503: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. STARK, Mr. MACK, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WU, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Res. 1507: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. HIRONO.
H. Res. 1523: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARROW, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 1524: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H. Res. 1528: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 1532: Mr. COSTA and Mrs. MALONEY.
H. Res. 1582: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H. Res. 1588: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Res. 1590: Mr. LINDER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Res. 1600: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HARE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BARTLETT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ARCURI.
H. Res. 1605: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BOYD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOYER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KRATOVIL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H. Res. 1613: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SIRE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.